Conflicting hagiographies and history: The place of Śaṅkaravijaya texts in Advaita tradition

Vidyasankar Sundaresan

THE TEXTS AND THEIR CULTURAL CONTEXT

Many legendary stories are current about Śaṅkarācārya, the teacher of Advaita Vedānta, some of which are recorded in texts known as the Śaṅkaravijayas.[1] The oft-quoted dates for Śaṅkara (788–820 CE) are found in one of these hagiographic texts, but internal evidence from Śaṅkara's undisputed works suggests a date earlier in the eighth century.[2] The *Mādhavīya Śaṅkaravijaya*, which informs most accounts of Śaṅkara's life in both popular and scholarly literature (Bader 1991; Lorenzen 1983), is traditionally attributed to Vidyāraṇya, who lived in the fourteenth century.[3] This text, along with another *Śaṅkaravijaya* by Anantānandagiri, was consulted in one of the earliest studies of Hinduism (Wilson 1977). The latter text is often mistakenly attributed to Ānandagiri, a thirteenth-century author of *ṭīkās* (subcommentaries) on Śaṅkara's works, but I show here that this text clearly dates from a much later period. *Mādhavīya* has two commentaries, *Ḍiṇḍima* by Dhanapatisūrin and *Advaitarājyalakṣmī* by Acyutarāya. Other important texts include Cidvilāsa's *Śaṅkaravijaya Vilāsa*, Sadānanda's *Śaṅkaravijaya Sāra*, on which Dhanapatisūrin wrote a commentary called *Dundubhi*, Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya*, and Govindanātha's *Śaṅkarācāryacarita*.

When one turns to the Daśanāmī *sampradāya*, the living tradition of monasticism in Advaita Vedānta, one realizes that the hagiology of Śaṅkara is an ongoing process. Daśanāmī monks, whose *maṭhas* (monasteries), *āśramas* (hermitages), and *akhāḍās* (schools) are found all over India, are so called because they use one of ten suffixes in their names: Araṇya, Āśrama, Bhāratī,

International Journal of Hindu Studies 4, 2 (August 2000): 109–84

Giri, Parvata, Purī, Sāgara, Sarasvatī, Tīrtha, and Vana. The authors who wrote about Śaṅkara were either themselves Daśanāmī *saṃnyāsins* (renunciants) or lay householder disciples, in whose families were born the men who became monks. This is the tradition that has produced hagiographic texts in the past and that continues to produce new texts while being influenced by the older ones. Nīlakaṇṭha's *Śaṅkaramandārasaurabha* and *Śaṅkarābhyudaya*, Hosiṅga Vāsudeva Dīkṣita's *Śaṅkaravijaya Campū*, and Lakṣmaṇasūrin's *Bhagavatpādābhyudaya* are very recent texts, each being just about a century old. Wade Dazey (1987) has studied the influence of popular hagiographies on the organization of Daśanāmī orders. However, studies of the written texts (Antarkar 1960, 1961, 1972) have not critically evaluated the claims of important monks and contemporary institutions. The written Śaṅkaravijaya texts, oral traditions, *saṃnyāsa* manuals, and *maṭha* texts reveal different aspects of a larger cultural tradition, incorporating several regional and temporal variants. Thus, Govindanātha says that Śaṅkara passed away at Trichūr in Kerala, although the more widely known tradition points to a site near Kedārnāth in the Himālayas. On the other hand, Himālayan oral traditions about Śaṅkara's debates with Buddhists (Sax 2000: 47) are not found in any of the written texts. Modern scholars have tended largely to be unaware of such variants. This paper attempts to correct this situation by relating a number of hagiographic texts to the context of Daśanāmī history and tradition.

Śaṅkara is said to have been born at Kālaṭi in Kerala and to have lived a short life of thirty-two years. He is attributed with great debating abilities, leading to his ascension to the Sarvajñapīṭha (seat of omniscience) in Kāśmīra toward the end of his life. He is credited with the establishment of four principal *maṭhas*, namely, the Jyotiṣpīṭha at Badrināth, Govardhanapīṭha at Purī, Śāradāpīṭha at Śṛṅgeri, and Kālikāpīṭha at Dvārakā. These are called the *āmnāya maṭhas*,[4] associated with the four Vedas, the corresponding Upaniṣad *mahāvākyas* (great sentences), and Śaṅkara's four chief disciples. The Daśanāmī *saṃnyāsa* orders are traditionally affiliated to these four *maṭhas*,[5] but in practice this is usually only nominal. A *maṭha* is primarily a residential educational center for monks, but the Hindu monk is ideally a wanderer (*parivrājaka*). Numerous *maṭhas* and *āśramas* have been established over time, either as official branches of preexisting institutions or separately by individual teachers. Vāraṇāsi alone is home to a number of *maṭhas* (Sawyer 1993). In northern India, the Daśanāmīs are also organized into six *akhāḍās*, named Ānanda, Aṭal, Āvāhan, Junā, Nirañjanī, and Mahānirvāṇī.[6] These are said to have come into being much later than the *āmnāya maṭhas*, but most monks identify themselves more strongly with their own institutions or with these *akhāḍās* than with the four principal *maṭhas*. For example, the right to precedence at the Kumbhamelās is decided

on the basis of *akhāḍā* affiliations. In the south, the *akhāḍās* are largely non-existent.

The heads of *maṭhas* are titled Śaṅkarācāryas, while the leaders of the *akhāḍās* are called Mahāmaṇḍaleśvaras. The latter is an elective position, and the disciples of a Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara cannot expect to inherit the title automatically. In contrast, the history of a *maṭha* is inseparably linked to its succession of Śaṅkarācāryas. Usually, the Śaṅkarācārya of a *maṭha* nominates one of his disciples to be his successor. Thus, each *maṭha* functions remarkably independently of the others, but succession disputes arise if the head of a *maṭha* passes away without unambiguously nominating a specific disciple. This leads to the involvement of other *maṭhas* and members of the larger monastic community, as exemplified in the recent history of the Badrināth *maṭha*. In the twentieth century, the *maṭhas* at Purī and Dvārakā have also witnessed disputes regarding succession issues. The resolution of such problems has contributed to close relations among the four *āmnāya maṭhas* in recent times.[7] Of these four principal *maṭhas*, Śṛṅgeri seems to have had the most stable history and continues to have a strong lay following, especially among Smārta Brāhmaṇa communities. This classical Advaita monastic tradition has also inspired modern neo-Vedāntic teachers, among whom Śivānanda and Cinmayānanda explicitly trace their lineage to the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*, while Paramahaṃsa Yogānanda traces his to the Purī *maṭha*.[8]

It is well known that in addition to the four Vedas, various candidates vie for the title of the fifth Veda, ranging from specific texts (the *Mahābhārata*) to entire disciplines (Āyurveda). Similarly, in addition to the four *āmnāya maṭhas*, numerous other institutions have claimed to be the fifth *maṭha*, established by Śaṅkara himself. These include the Kāmakoṭipīṭha at Kāñcīpuram, the Sumerupīṭha at Vārāṇāsi, and the Karavīrapīṭha at Kolhāpur. However, like the tenuous status of the fifth Veda, the claims to antiquity of these other *maṭhas* have not gone unchallenged. Of these, perhaps the one institution that has obtained the greatest degree of general importance is the Kāñcīpuram *maṭha*, under the leadership of its late centenarian head, Candraśekharendra Sarasvatī. Today this *maṭha* is very prominent, and its head wields much political influence. As both Śṛṅgeri and Kāñcī *maṭhas* are located in southern India, relations between the two are marked by rivalry and competition, usually extremely fierce but sometimes cooperative and friendly. Not surprisingly, the claim of any institution to be considered a fifth principal *maṭha* creates its own traditions that affect the hagiographic literature.

Accounts found in the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s *Gururatnamālā* and *Suṣamā* differ widely from those in other sources such as Śṛṅgeri's *Guruvaṃśakāvya*. The Kāñcī texts hold that Śaṅkara spent his last days at Kāñcīpuram, where he

ascended the Sarvajñapīṭha and established a fifth *maṭha* for himself as a central institution.[9] This disputes the tradition of four *āmnāya maṭhas* as well as the more widely accepted traditions of the Sarvajñapīṭha in Kāśmīra and Śaṅkara's last days in the Himālayas.[10] In terms of *āmnāya* classification, at least two different claims have been made. One set of publications claims the Dakṣiṇāmnāya title for the Kāñcī *maṭha* (Aiyer and Sastri 1962; Devasenapati 1975; Mahadevan 1983). This necessarily comes at the expense of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*, so that the same publications claim that Śṛṅgeri is not an old institution but only a branch of another *maṭha* at Kūḍalī.[11] Another claim is that the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* had been in a state of 'lapse' for a long period of time (N. Venkataraman 1923: 25–27). A different technique has been to seek to add a new *āmnāya* designation, with a different set of implications. Thus, Candraśekharendra Sarasvatī of the Kāñcī *maṭha* has claimed that Kāñcī represents the *mūlāmnāya* (the root *āmnāya*)[12] and is the parent of the entire Daśanāmī order, with Indra-Sarasvatī as its unique suffix (Sunil 1987: 11). This directly brings this *maṭha* into conflict with the other three *āmnāya maṭhas*. In response, leaders of the Dvārakā and Purī *maṭhas* have strongly repudiated the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s claim to an independent lineage from Śaṅkara.[13] Other Daśanāmī *akhāḍā* records are remarkably silent about a *maṭha* at Kāñcī (Giri 1976: 15–17) and regard Indra-Sarasvatī only as a variant of Sarasvatī, one of the standard ten suffixes. The Sarasvatī suffix is unanimously assigned by all Daśanāmī traditions to the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*, whose followers therefore insist that the Kāñcī *maṭha* is at least nominally subordinate.[14] The Kāñcī *maṭha* seems to have been originally based at Kumbhakoṇam,[15] near Tañjāvūr, where its oldest attested record dates from 1821 CE. Numerous lines of evidence show that the heads of this *maṭha* established themselves in Kāñcī after a *kumbhābhiṣekam* (temple-consecration ceremony) of the Kāmākṣī temple in 1842 (Sharma 1987: 154). The Kāñcī *maṭha* claims that the 1842 temple ceremony marked a move back to its original home, as unstable political conditions had forced a move from Kāñcīpuram to Kumbhakoṇam at the turn of the nineteenth century.[16] There is a tradition, recorded in many Śaṅkaravijaya texts, that Śaṅkara visited Kāñcīpuram, consecrated a *śrīcakra* (ritual diagram representing the goddess), and worshipped the goddess Kāmākṣī. Śṛṅgeri followers do not contest this legendary account of Śaṅkara's visit to Kāñcīpuram but reject the claims that the Kāñcī *maṭha* was established by Śaṅkara and has a right to the name Kāmakoṭipīṭha. In their view, the Kāmakoṭipīṭha refers to the *śrīcakra* at the Kāmākṣī temple in Kāñcīpuram, which cannot be equated with a *maṭha*.[17]

For most academic purposes, it is expedient to ignore such *maṭha* disputes. However, specific Śaṅkaravijaya texts have come to be associated exclusively with each of these *maṭhas*, so that although this controversy is less than two

centuries old,[18] it assumes much importance for any study of Śaṅkara's hagiography. The leaders of the Daśanāmī *akhāḍā*s and heads of all four *āmnāya maṭha*s seem to hold the *Mādhavīya Śaṅkaravijaya* in high esteem (B. Upadhyaya 1967: xi–xxii), and its widespread acceptance within the tradition is reflected in most modern literature on Śaṅkara. In addition, its attribution to Vidyāraṇya leads to a close alignment of the text with the Śṛṅgeri tradition. The Kāñcī *maṭha* strongly denies that Vidyāraṇya wrote the *Mādhavīya Śaṅkaravijaya* and claims that the text copies large portions from other late texts (Rama Sastri 1976: 2–3). It also claims that the text was significantly altered in the late nineteenth century, in order to highlight the importance of the *maṭha* at Śṛṅgeri over that at Kāñcī (Narayana Sastri 1916: 158–65). The *Śaṅkaravijaya* of Anantānandagiri is quoted frequently by Kāñcī *maṭha* followers and has come to be regarded as embodying its independent tradition (Lorenzen 1987: 64). However, one early Kāñcī source dismisses the text as 'a valueless forgery' (N. Venkataraman 1923: 16), and Śṛṅgeri followers have consistently rejected this text (Aiyar nd; Dakshinamurthy 1973). As I demonstrate below, this dispute has so greatly influenced a number of Advaita scholars from the University of Madras that even the project of preparing a critical edition of this text has afforded further opportunities for partisanship. The *Śaṅkaravijaya*s of Mādhava and Anantānandagiri being the two most widely cited texts, it is impossible to ignore the mutual relationship between Śaṅkara's hagiography and the contemporary Śaṅkaran *maṭha*s. Although the *maṭha*s function more or less independently, they belong to the same larger tradition of Daśanāmī *saṃnyāsa*. Varying *maṭha* claims must, therefore, be evaluated against other independent sources of history and chronology.

However, it should not be assumed that all four *āmnāya maṭha*s always report the same traditions about Śaṅkara or are always pitted against the Kāñcī *maṭha*. There are many variant traditions, the most problematic being those regarding *maṭha* succession lineages and Śaṅkara's date. There are numerous gaps in the Badrināth lineage, showing repeated breaks in its history. The list of successors to the Śaṅkarācārya title at Dvārakā is very long, but the Purī list is even longer, with about twice as many names. These three *maṭha*s often claim a date of origin in the fifth century BCE, relying upon a grant supposedly given by a king named Sudhanvan to Śaṅkara. If such a grant exists and is genuine, it would have to rank as one of the earliest examples of writing in India, but it has never been made available for detailed analysis.[19] The Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* does not accept this date, and its lineage gives only about half as many names as the Dvārakā list.[20] Up to Vidyā Tīrtha (also called Vidyāśaṅkara), the *guru* of Vidyāraṇya, Śṛṅgeri's lineage is based mainly upon oral tradition, there being very few historical records of Śṛṅgeri from pre-Vijayanagara times. Vidyāraṇya,

whose association with the Vijayanagara kingdom has become legendary, was the head of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* in the fourteenth century. The pre-Vidyāraṇya lineage of Śṛṅgeri receives independent confirmation from a fifteenth-century Marathi text of the Dattātreya *sampradāya*,[21] but Śṛṅgeri's Vijayanagara-era records seem to be the oldest reliable historical evidence available for any *maṭha* in the Advaita tradition. For post-Vidyāraṇya times, the *maṭha*'s traditionally reported lineage tallies remarkably well with what can be reconstructed from inscriptions and other records (Shastry 1982: iv). Jürgen Lütt (1978: 411) holds that Śṛṅgeri must be the oldest institution and points out that the earliest available records of the Purī *maṭha* date only from the seventeenth century. Historical records of the other *maṭha*s and Daśanāmī *akhāḍā*s seem to be even sparser and have not been studied closely. Sadānanda Giri (1976: 6) assigns some of these records to the ninth century, but Dazey (1987: v) dates them to late medieval times. There is also a tradition crediting Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, a late sixteenth-century Advaitin, with having organized many of the Daśanāmī *nāga* groups (Ghurye 1953; Giri 1976; Sarkar 1946).

One way to take a neutral attitude with respect to such conflicting accounts is to concede as much as possible to all *maṭha* traditions. Thus, William Cenkner (1983) and G. C. Pande (1994) simply accept a number of variant *maṭha* traditions, without critically evaluating any of them or relating them to independent historical evidence. This seems to be an overly credulous approach that, in turn, affects others who rely on these scholars for information about the Advaita monastic institutions. Thus Richard King (1999: 129) and others routinely mention Kāñcī along with the four *āmnāya maṭha*s, whereas even modern Hindu institutions that would acknowledge this *maṭha* tend to describe it as secondary to Śṛṅgeri (Patchen 1989: 322; Subramuniyasvāmī 1993: 808–9). An older generation of scholars completely disregarded all the *maṭha* traditions, doubting whether Śaṅkara really established any *maṭha*s at all. This extreme skepticism has resulted in a number of more or less fanciful postulates about the origins and growth of *maṭha*s. Thus, M. R. Bodas (1923: 5) suggests that the original southern *āmnāya maṭha* must have been located at Rāmeśvaram, the southern center in the *cār-dhāma* (four centers of pilgrimage) network. There is no real evidence for an old Advaita *maṭha* at this place, and it is the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* that has historically been associated with the major temples at Rāmeśvaram. Paul Hacker (1978: 478–80) says that none of the *maṭha* lists are reliable for the pre-fourteenth century period; he, therefore, concludes that Śaṅkara did not establish any *maṭha*s at all. He proposes that it was Vidyāraṇya who established the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* in the fourteenth century and either originated or greatly popularized the tradition of affiliating the Daśanāmī orders with the four *āmnāya maṭha*s.[22] Hacker sees this as part of Vijayanagara politics in the fourteenth

century, basing his postulate on his reading of the *Mādhavīya Śaṅkaravijaya* that he unquestioningly attributes to Vidyāraṇya. As this attribution has been challenged seriously in recent times, Hacker's proposal will have to be reconsidered after analyzing textual issues. Meanwhile, it must be noted that among the four *āmnāya maṭha*s, only the Śṛṅgeri lineage lists Vidyāraṇya. Thus there is no evidence that he established all these *maṭha*s himself. If one credits Vidyāraṇya only with popularizing the four *āmnāya maṭha* tradition, one must grant that all four *maṭha*s may have been functioning prior to his times. Karl Potter (1982: 113) goes further than Hacker and holds that the assumptions and practices of the Daśanāmī orders are fundamentally antithetical to Śaṅkara's thought. This assumes an unjustifiable hiatus between Advaita thought and the associated tradition of Brāhmaṇical *saṃnyāsa* that is older than Śaṅkara himself. This position may also be criticized for not being based on a comprehensive and critical investigation of *maṭha* and *akhāḍā* records. Such a study, along with the production of critical editions of Śaṅkaran texts, is long overdue and may offer better insights into the relationship of Śaṅkara to the Daśanāmī *saṃnyāsa* tradition.

That, however, is not the goal of the present discussion. As far as historical issues brought up by the Śaṅkaravijaya texts are concerned, it is sufficient to acknowledge that the widespread Daśanāmī orders have traditionally preserved a memory of an intimate association of Śaṅkara and his disciples with the four *āmnāya maṭha*s at Śṛṅgeri, Dvārakā, Badrināth, and Purī. A simple explanation for this is that these four are the oldest *maṭha*s and that all other institutions, including the one at Kāñcī, originate from relatively later times. One could suppose that different Daśanāmī institutions came into being over a period of time and that important post-Śaṅkara leaders, like Vidyāraṇya or Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, consolidated the existing ones into a national network, with regional centers at the prominent *maṭha*s of their times. If so, there is no reason a *maṭha* in such an important pilgrimage center as Kāñcīpuram would have been left out of all old Daśanāmī records.[23] One could accept the contention of A. N. Aiyer and S. L. Sastri (1962) that there has been an ancient and successful conspiracy to deny due recognition to the Kāñcī *maṭha*. This assumes a degree of concerted effort and internal cohesion on the part of all other Daśanāmī institutions that does not seem even remotely possible. It would be more reasonable to conclude, with Tapasyānanda (1980: xxiv), that whatever the actual origins of the four *āmnāya maṭha* tradition may be, the Kāñcī *maṭha* is a much younger institution.[24]

On the other hand, W. R. Antarkar, the first twentieth-century scholar to have studied most of the Śaṅkaravijaya texts in some detail, accepts all the claims of the Kāñcī *maṭha*, often to the exclusion of other, more widespread Daśanāmī

traditions. William Cenkner (1983), Natalia Isayeva (1993), David Lorenzen (1983), and Yoshitsugu Sawai (1992), who accept most of Antarkar's conclusions, perhaps do not realize that this uncritical outlook seriously compromises his analysis. Pande (1994), who has also analyzed some of the important primary texts, comes to significantly different conclusions. For example, while Antarkar (1972: 21–23) agrees with the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s claim that the *Mādhavīya* borrows heavily from other texts, Pande thinks that this text has become the victim of highly unfair criticism from the Kāñcī *maṭha*. However, both Antarkar and Pande seem to subscribe to a rather naive notion that every available legend carries reliable and factual historical information about Śaṅkara and that all variant legends can be made somehow to corroborate one another. As the following discussion will show, this results in serious misjudgments of both the written texts and the oral traditions.

THE *BṚHAT ŚAṄKARAVIJAYA* AND THE *PRĀCĪNA ŚAṄKARAVIJAYA*

A *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya* has been attributed to one Citsukha, and a *Prācīna Śaṅkaravijaya* to Ānandagiri, the *ṭīkākāra* (author of *ṭīkās*) of the Advaita tradition. Although an extensive search failed to locate any manuscript of either work,[25] Antarkar (1960: 114, 119) reports that he has been 'reliably informed' that the Kāñcī *maṭha* possesses manuscripts of both texts. He does not reveal his sources or how he estimated their reliability, nor does he tell us why he could not obtain copies from the Kāñcī *maṭha*. The only original sources for quotations from a *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya* of Citsukha are T. S. Narayana Sastri (1916) and the author of *Suṣamā* (Antarkar 1960: 120), both of whom go to great pains to proclaim the supremacy of the Kāñcī *maṭha* over all other institutions and thus need to be taken *cum grano salis*. Both misquote well-known works and take unverifiable quotations from works long lost or completely unknown.[26] Narayana Sastri (1916: 87) claims to have seen fragments of a manuscript of Citsukha's *Śaṅkaravijaya*; he also claims that Citsukha was a childhood friend and a disciple of Śaṅkara[27] and that his work is an authoritative biography written by an eyewitness. Narayana Sastri also claims that both Sadānanda's *Śaṅkaravijaya Sāra* and Cidvilāsa's *Śaṅkaravijaya Vilāsa* follow Citsukha's account. Some hagiographies include the name Citsukha among Śaṅkara's disciples, but none of them describe him as a childhood friend of Śaṅkara or as an earlier author of a *Śaṅkaravijaya*. Cidvilāsa and Sadānanda, who supposedly rely upon this Citsukha, are also remarkably silent about this

story. Indeed, Sadānanda differs quite significantly from what has been attributed to Citsukha and instead seems indebted to the *Mādhavīya* (Antarkar 1960: 116, 1961: 79; Rama Sastri 1976: 1). With no corroborative evidence, all claims about Citsukha and his *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya* ultimately derive from a highly questionable, solitary source.

There is better evidence to attribute a *Śaṅkaravijaya* to Ānandagiri, the *ṭīkākāra*, although no manuscripts seem to be currently available. For reasons discussed below, this text should be distinguished from that of Anantānandagiri. The first verse of the *Mādhavīya* mentions a *Prācīna Śaṅkarajaya*. Acyutarāya's commentary, *Advaitarājyalakṣmī*, interprets this as a reference to Ānandagiri's *Prācīna Śaṅkaravijaya*.[28] However, in his comment on *Mādhavīya* (15.3), Acyutarāya quotes fifty-eight verses that he attributes to a *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya* of Ānandagiri.[29] Dhanapatisūrin's *Ḍiṇḍima*, an earlier commentary on the *Mādhavīya*, quotes the same fifty-eight verses in the same context but without specific attribution. Acyutarāya again refers to Ānandagiri's *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya* in the context of *Mādhavīya* (16.103), but his quotation there has been traced to a text named *Śivarahasya*.[30] This makes it very doubtful that Acyutarāya referred to actual manuscripts of Ānandagiri's text. In addition to these quotations, another seven hundred fifty-three verses are anonymously quoted elsewhere in the *Ḍiṇḍima*, and Antarkar infers that these must have also originally been in Ānandagiri's text. This inference is not really supported by the available evidence. Dhanapatisūrin himself does not identify any unique source, and his anonymous introductions do not allow the conclusion that all his quotations are taken from the same text. Thus, it can be questioned whether the fifty-eight verses given by both the commentators can all be attributed to Ānandagiri. Both *Dundubhi*, Dhanapatisūrin's commentary on the *Śaṅkaravijaya Sāra* of Sadānanda, and an auto-commentary on Śṛṅgeri's *Guruvaṃśakāvya* generally mention a text by Ānandagiri but give no specific name to this work and attribute no quotations to it. It is possible that Acyutarāya's adjectives, *prācīna* and *bṛhat*, merely indicate that Ānandagiri's text is old and voluminous, but such an interpretation would exclude their usage in a nominative sense. Alternatively, Acyutarāya may be seen as having independently used only the word *bṛhat* because he uses the word *prācīna* only under *Mādhavīya* (1.1), which itself refers to a *Prācīna Śaṅkarajaya*. It is also appropriate here to note Polakam Rama Sastri's claim, that Mūkakavi, a fifteenth-century poet, composed a *Prācīna Śaṅkaravijaya*.[31] In summary, it is probable that a *Śaṅkaravijaya* attributed to Ānandagiri was available at some time in the past. However, without gaining access to and evaluating its primary manuscripts, no specific name should be given to this text, and quotations attributed to it must be viewed critically.

THE *ŚAṄKARAVIJAYA* OF ANANTĀNANDAGIRI

This text is often referred to as the *Ānandagirīya*, which misleadingly implies an author named Ānandagiri.[32] None of the verses quoted by Dhanapatisūrin or Acyutarāya are found in this text. The author gives his own name as Anantānandagiri, not Ānandagiri, and claims to be a direct disciple of Śaṅkara.[33] Ānandagiri, the *ṭīkākāra*, was a disciple of Śuddhānanda, and he lived most probably in the thirteenth century. Chapters 11 and 47 of Anantānandagiri's text quote *verbatim* from the *Adhikaraṇa Ratnamālā* (also called *Vaiyāsika Nyāyamālā*) of Bhāratī Tīrtha (1980), a fourteenth-century author. In both chapters, the quotations are put into Śaṅkara's mouth as if they were his own words. In chapter 47, the *Adhikaraṇa Ratnamālā* is named explicitly, and Śaṅkara is further depicted as explaining the quoted verse in great detail.[34] As these quotations are an integral part of this text, Anantānandagiri must have lived after the fourteenth century. This takes him to a date much later than that of the *ṭīkākāra* and also falsifies his claim to having been a disciple of Śaṅkara himself.[35] Many modern scholars are subject to a double error caused by the similarity in names and mistakenly attribute this text to Ānandagiri, the *ṭīkākāra*, whom they also assume to have been Śaṅkara's direct disciple.[36] Ānandagiri and Anantānandagiri clearly seem to have been two different authors, and neither of them was Śaṅkara's disciple. In order to keep these two authors distinct and to clear away all the unnecessary confusion about this text, I will refer to the author only by the name Anantānandagiri and to this text only as the *Anantānandagirīya*.

Three editions of the *Anantānandagirīya* were published in the nineteenth century, two in Calcutta in 1868 (reprinted in 1982) and 1881 and another in Madras.[37] N. Veezhinathan published an edition in 1971 at the University of Madras, with an introduction by T. M. P. Mahadevan. There has been a fierce controversy over this text for many decades now. Followers of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* hold that this text is wrongly attributed to the *ṭīkākāra*. As already noted above, there is good reason to support this position. Śṛṅgeri adherents also criticize the nineteenth-century Madras edition as an 'embellished' text favorable to the Kāñcī *maṭha* because it describes itself as a *pariṣkṛta* (embellished) work and differs in certain key particulars from both Calcutta editions (Aiyar and Venkataraman 1977: 26–37, 121–25). Kāñcī followers rely almost completely on this text and hold that it was written by the *ṭīkākāra* himself. Antarkar (1960, 1961) is quite aware of this controversy over the text and rejects the claim that its author was Ānandagiri, the *ṭīkākāra*. However, he relies almost totally upon Kāñcī *maṭha* sources in various other aspects of his analysis, as

discussed below.

(*i*) Antarkar goes out of his way to defend the supposed age and reliability of this text. He says nothing about its quotations from the *Adhikaraṇa Ratnamālā* and seeks to explain away its stories of the miraculous and the supernatural by appealing to parapsychology, clairvoyance, telepathy, and extrasensory perception. He dismisses earlier textual criticisms on the grounds that judgments of style and language usage are apt to be subjective and inconclusive. Nevertheless, he goes on to say that this text shares great similarity in style and content with the quotations made by Dhanapatisūrin and Acyutarāya, but he does not see fit to apply similar arguments in favor of the other texts. Most of his own arguments against the *Mādhavīya* are based on style and language, and he finds fault with it for having a substantial element of the supernatural (Antarkar 1972: 5–19). The inconsistency is striking.

(*ii*) Antarkar is strangely silent about some rather surprising features of Anantānandagiri's text, where Śaṅkara is frequently depicted as defeating his debating opponents by resorting to verbal and physical abuse. In chapters 23, 25 through 28, and 37, bodily harm is inflicted upon two Kāpālikas, a Cārvāka, a Saugata, a Jaina and his disciples, a Bauddha, and a devotee of Varāha. Furthermore, during his debate with Vyāsa, an exasperated Śaṅkara slaps the old man on the face and orders Padmapāda to push him face down and drag him away by his feet. Vyāsa, now afraid, moves out of reach. Antarkar's (1961: 78) only comment about this extremely negative image of Śaṅkara is that Anantānandagiri describes the Śaṅkara-Vyāsa dialogue in a 'queer fashion'! On the other hand, he is extremely concerned about the manner in which the *Mādhavīya* portrays Śaṅkara's personality, stringently criticizes its account of the debate between Maṇḍana Miśra and Śaṅkara on the grounds that its introductory bantering tone does not bring credit to either person. Again, the inconsistency in his standards for evaluating these texts stands out significantly.

(*iii*) Śṛṅgeri sources have consistently maintained that the *Anantānandagirīya* should not be attributed to Ānandagiri, the *ṭīkākāra*. This *maṭha*'s tradition would agree that Ānandagiri, the *ṭīkākāra*, wrote a *Śaṅkaravijaya*, but it unequivocally rejects the idea that such a text is identical with the *Anantānandagirīya*. Antarkar finds sufficient reason to agree with this assessment. However, when finding fault with the Śṛṅgeri criticism of Anantānandagiri's text, he inexplicably equates Ānandagiri and Anantānandagiri, contradicting himself with respect to the identities of these authors.[38] Antarkar does not bother to check if the Śṛṅgeri criticism of this text indicates more than just anti-Kāñcī polemic. Śṛṅgeri followers point out that this text's descriptions of Śaṅkara, especially in the debate with Vyāsa, are reminiscent of texts like *Maṇimañjarī*, belonging to the Dvaita school, and think that the basic intention of such

legends is to ridicule Śaṅkara (Aiyar and Venkataraman 1977: 37).

(*iv*) Horace H. Wilson's early study of medieval Hindu traditions relies partly on the *Anantānandagirīya*. Antarkar (1961: 77) attributes the following quotation to Wilson: 'The work is sufficiently historical since it bears internal and indisputable evidence of being the composition of a period not far removed from that at which he (Śaṅkara) may be supposed to have flourished.' This is a sentence found *verbatim* in almost all Kāñcī *maṭha* literature, and Antarkar's source for this quote is a pamphlet from the Kāñcī *maṭha*. Although Wilson does refer to this text, his actual estimate of it reads very differently:

> Some of the marvels it records of Śaṅkara, which the author professes to have seen, may be thought to affect its credibility, if not its authenticity, and *either Ānandagiri must be an unblushing liar, or the book is not his own*; it is, however, of little consequence, as *even if the work be not that of Ānandagiri himself*, it bears internal and indisputable evidence of being the composition of a period, *not far removed from that at which he may be* supposed to have flourished (1977: 14; emphasis added).

Nowhere does Wilson say that the work is 'sufficiently historical.' Contrary to Antarkar's parenthetical addition of the name Śaṅkara, the 'he' in his original statement refers only to the author of this text. Wilson clearly expresses his reservations about the text. However, he assumes that Ānandagiri was Śaṅkara's disciple and overlooks his own doubts about this text only because he assigns to it a date close to that of Ānandagiri. As the extant work is clearly post-fourteenth century, Wilson's estimates of the date of the text and the identity of its author are both equally mistaken. However, it is most significant that Antarkar ignores Wilson's own statement and quotes only a deliberately misleading version of it.

(*v*) Antarkar (1961: 78) notes A. C. Burnell's (1880) opinion that this *Śaṅkaravijaya* is a modern and unreliable text, being full of discrepancies and mistakes. He claims that Burnell has given no reason for this assessment. However, Burnell's catalogue of the Tañjāvūr Sarasvatī Mahal Library's manuscript collection is quite explicit:

> This seems to be a quite modern work written in the interests of the schismatic maṭhas on the Coromandel Coast, which have renounced obedience to the Çriṅgeri maṭha, where Çaṅkarācārya's legitimate successor resides. This book has been indifferently printed in the B.I. and at Madras (1880: 96).

Further comment is perhaps needless, but note the reference to an early printed

edition from Madras. Antarkar (1961: 79) could find only the two nineteenth-century editions from Calcutta. He quotes Rama Sastri of the Kāñcī *maṭha* and concludes that Śṛṅgeri followers who criticize the nineteenth-century Madras edition are actually referring only to a paper manuscript at the Tañjāvūr Library. It is perhaps understandable that Antarkar was unable to locate an old and obscure edition, but, as with the supposed quotation attributed to Wilson, his disregard of Burnell's comment reveals a blind reliance upon sources partial to the Kāñcī *maṭha*.

(*vi*) Anantānandagiri's text implicitly refers to Rāmānuja and Madhva, the Vaiṣṇava founders of rival Vedānta schools. Antarkar remarks that he was unable to find any such reference and complains that publications from neither Śṛṅgeri nor Kāñcī inform him where this is located. He might have found it easily, if he had only read the text as carefully as the *maṭha* pamphlets. Chapter 68 of the text carries an unambiguous title of 'Vaiṣṇavamatasthāpanam.' According to Anantānandagiri, when Śaṅkara was in Kāñcīpuram, he sent out a few disciples to propagate the Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava, Śākta, Gāṇapatya, Saura, and Kāpālika traditions.[39] Five of these traditions are assigned one disciple each, but Vaiṣṇavism alone gets two. Chapter 68 describes two Vaiṣṇava disciples named Lakṣmaṇa and Hastāmalaka, who are incarnations of Ādiśeṣa and Vāyu, respectively.[40] Acting under Śaṅkara's command, Lakṣmaṇa propagates the Vaiṣṇava religion by preaching to Brāhmaṇas in the east, making them wear the vertical caste mark, and branding the marks of the conch and discus on their shoulders. It should be obvious that these are references to Rāmānuja and the Śrīvaiṣṇavas. The very name Lakṣmaṇa suggests Rāmānuja (younger brother of Rāma), who is also traditionally said to have been an *aṃśa* (part) of Ādiśeṣa. Anantānandagiri's intended reference to Rāmānuja is reinforced when he says that Lakṣmaṇa lived in Kāñcīpuram and wrote his own *bhāṣyas* (commentaries). The other disciple, Hastāmalaka, converts Brāhmaṇas in the west to Vaiṣṇavism, making them wear the five Vaiṣṇava marks. He teaches the eight-syllable Vaiṣṇava *mantra* and consecrates a Kṛṣṇa idol at Rajatapīṭha (modern Uḍupi).[41] These words clearly point to Madhva, the Dvaita philosopher, who lived and taught in Uḍupi and was considered an incarnation of Vāyu. Even the geographical centers of the followers of Rāmānuja (Kāñcīpuram) and Madhva (Uḍupi) are neatly taken care of. Still, Antarkar absolves this text of all anachronisms while finding fault with *Mādhavīya* and other texts in this regard.[42]

Clearly, Antarkar's conclusion that Anantānandagiri's text is an early and reliable one is extremely faulty. The barely concealed reference to Rāmānuja and Madhva and the quotation from Bhāratī Tīrtha's *Adhikaraṇa Ratnamālā* indicate a post-fourteenth-century date. Antarkar simply disclaims the former reference and seems unaware of the latter. He contradicts himself about the identity of the

author when he wishes to question the Śṛṅgeri criticism of this text. He ignores the old Tañjāvūr Library catalogue that provides Burnell's estimate of the text and explicitly mentions the old Madras edition that he thinks to be non-existent. Even for a quote from Wilson, Antarkar prefers to refer to the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s misquotation. This inspires no confidence in the independence of his analysis, and it is hard to escape the conclusion that he tries to legitimate this text only because of his own partisanship toward Kāñcī *maṭha* sources.[43]

The Kāñcī **maṭha** *and Veezhinathan's edition of* **Anantānandagirīya**

It is instructive to examine briefly a few early references to this text before proceeding to discuss the 1971 edition by Veezhinathan. Wilson relies on Anantānandagiri's text only for its description of different Hindu traditions, not for its story of Śaṅkara's life. Instead, he turns to the *Mādhavīya* and other oral traditions to locate the Sarvajñapīṭha at Kāśmīra and Śaṅkara's last days in the Himālayas. Wilson (1977: 200–201) also gives a lineage list from Śṛṅgeri, quoting an old *maṭha* manuscript. J. N. Bhattacharya (1968: 296) refers to the 1868 edition of Anantānandagiri's text and mentions the four *āmnāya maṭha*s but not the Kāñcī *maṭha*. Both these authors say that Śaṅkara was born in Kerala, although the nineteenth-century Calcutta editions of Anantānandagiri's text place his birth at Cidambaram. V. S. Ghate (1924) mentions both the Kālaṭi and Cidambaram versions but places the Sarvajñapīṭha in Kāśmīra and mentions only the *maṭha*s at Śṛṅgeri, Dvārakā, Purī, and Badrināth. Burnell explicitly affiliates this text with *maṭha*s that had rejected the authority of Śṛṅgeri, while Max Weber describes the head of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* as 'the mightiest until the present' (1967: 300).[44] It is clear that in the late nineteenth century, Śṛṅgeri continued to be the most important center of the Śaṅkaran tradition, while Kāñcī (or Kumbhakoṇam) was relatively unknown. These references are also consistent with the fact that the nineteenth-century Calcutta editions of *Anantānandagirīya* mention neither a *maṭha* nor a Sarvajñapīṭha at Kāñcī.

On the other hand, if this text is to be especially related to the Kāñcī *maṭha* (Lorenzen 1987), this is due in no small measure to Veezhinathan's 1971 edition published in Madras. Numerous lines of evidence show that this so-called 'critical edition' of the text seems to have been specifically designed to proclaim the superiority of the Kāñcī *maṭha* over Śṛṅgeri. Veezhinathan's (1971: vii) preface criticizes Burnell for having made 'very disparaging' comments and finds fault with him for talking of schismatic *maṭha*s in the plural. When Burnell catalogued the Tañjāvūr Library's collection, he was primarily a British colonial administrator. It cannot reasonably be claimed that he had some

partisan feeling for the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*. His statement about Śṛṅgeri and schismatic *maṭhas* probably reflects his own reading of the historical evidence from Tañjāvūr. He must have been aware of the history of the nineteenth-century conflict between the Kumbhakoṇam-Kāñcī and Śṛṅgeri *maṭhas*. Burnell's use of the plural number is also quite understandable. To an outsider, the *maṭhas* at Kāñcīpuram and Kumbhakoṇam might have appeared to be two different, if related, institutions,[45] but we cannot rule out that Burnell was perhaps aware of other southern *maṭhas* with similar claims.

Veezhinathan acknowledges that the quotation from Bhāratī Tīrtha's *Adhikaraṇa Ratnamālā* in chapter 11 is found in all manuscripts but asserts that this is entirely a late interpolation into the text. He says nothing about the more explicit reference to the work in chapter 47. It should nevertheless follow that the extant text is not by a single author, but Veezhinathan provides no evidence to think that the original author may have been Ānandagiri or some other earlier author. Neither Mahadevan nor Veezhinathan bothers to examine this authorship problem in any detail, although they claim to have produced a 'critical edition.' A similarly arbitrary approach to what is original and what is a late addition to the text is seen in chapter 68, which contains the veiled references to Rāmānuja and Madhva. Although the first sentence of this chapter declares the Vaiṣṇava disciple, Lakṣmaṇa, to be an incarnation of Ādiśeṣa, Veezhinathan's (1971: 188–90) footnote simply asserts otherwise. He includes the text's descriptions of Lakṣmaṇa and Hastāmalaka in parentheses and claims that Tantric Vaiṣṇavas may have interpolated these sentences into Anantānandagiri's text. If these were late interpolations, whoever introduced them must have considered themselves followers of Śaṅkara and may not have been Tantric Vaiṣṇavas at all. The intention of the text seems to be to subordinate both Rāmānuja and Madhva to Śaṅkara by calling them his disciples. In any case, if the descriptions of Śaṅkara's Vaiṣṇava disciples are late additions to an original text, the same could be said of the descriptions of the Śākta, Śaiva, and other disciples in the adjoining chapters. These chapters also claim to describe Śaṅkara's last days in Kāñcīpuram. Veezhinathan does not foresee that his reasoning, carried to its logical end, can only end in a conclusion that all these chapters have been heavily tampered with or are perhaps entirely late additions, thereby vindicating Burnell's opinion of this text.

Mahadevan (Veezhinathan 1971: i–xxiv) refrains from naming Śṛṅgeri explicitly in his introduction, preferring to talk of 'the institution on the banks of the Tuṅgabhadrā.' In contrast, he extols the holiness of Kāñcīpuram in great detail and says that Śaṅkara wanted to spend his last days there because it is the only southern *mokṣapurī* (place that grants liberation).[46] To substantiate this claim, he includes pictures of sculptures from temples in and around Kāñcīpuram that

depict *ekadaṇḍī saṃnyāsins* (monks holding a single staff) and claims that all of them represent Śaṅkara. Most of these sculptures date to late Vijayanagara times. All that Mahadevan proves is that sculptors in Kāñcī have depicted *ekadaṇḍī saṃnyāsins*. It is not necessary that all the cited instances are sculptures of Śaṅkara.[47] Hindu *saṃnyāsa* has an ancient history, and similar artistic depictions can probably be found elsewhere, including places where there are no currently famous *maṭhas*. Curiously, Mahadevan does not even acknowledge the presence of the more widespread tradition that places Śaṅkara in his last days in the Himālayas. He then cites Antarkar and Acyutarāya's commentary on the *Mādhavīya* to equate Anantānandagiri's text with Ānandagiri's *Bṛhat* or *Prācīna Śaṅkaravijaya*. This identification with Ānandagiri's lost text is so complete that although the title page refers to Anantānandagiri, the index page names only Ānandagiri. The fifty-eight verses given by Acyutarāya and the seven hundred and fifty-three additional verses of Dhanapatisūrin are also included as appendices to this edition. It must be reiterated that Antarkar was 'reliably informed' that the Kāñcī *maṭha* possesses manuscripts of Ānandagiri's *Prācīna* and Citsukha's *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya* texts. Mahadevan says nothing whatsoever about Citsukha and simply identifies Anantānandagiri with Ānandagiri.[48]

Interestingly, all the chapters in Veezhinathan's edition have been given titles, except for the one that mentions Śṛṅgeri. Thus, chapter 60 is titled 'Nṛsiṃha Sākṣātkāraḥ,' chapter 61 is 'Sarasvatī Jayaḥ,' and chapter 63 is 'Kāñcī Nagara Nirmāṇam'; whereas chapter 62, which describes Śaṅkara's stay at Śṛṅgeri, is a plain 'Dviṣaṣṭi Prakaraṇam' ('chapter 62') (Veezhinathan 1971: 181–83). The index and the chapter colophon mention *Guroḥ Sarasavāṇyāśca Śṛṅgagiri-sthāna Nivāsanam*, but the text mentions the establishment of a temple for Sarasavāṇī *near* Śṛṅgeri (*śṛṅgagiri samīpe*), and the older reading of *āśrama* has been altered to *āśrayā*. Chapter 63 mentions Padmapāda as the head of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*, and Veezhinathan's footnote says that this is the reading in all manuscripts. Surely Veezhinathan, who refers frequently to the earlier editions, should know that both Calcutta editions and all their source manuscripts mention Sureśvara, not Padmapāda, at Śṛṅgeri.[49] In chapter 65 of the 1971 edition, Sureśvara is reserved for the Kāñcī *maṭha* itself, whereas the older editions do not mention any *maṭha* at Kāñcī. Chapter 63 also mentions the establishment of a *bhogaliṅga* (Śiva-*liṅga* named for enjoyment) at Śṛṅgeri, while chapters 65 and 74 mention a *yogaliṅga* (Śiva-*liṅga* named for union) at Kāñcīpuram and a *mokṣaliṅga* (Śiva-*liṅga* named for liberation) at Cidambaram. The corresponding footnotes and the preface inform us that these details about Śiva-*liṅgas* are found only in Kāñcī *maṭha* manuscripts, citing another text named *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā* in support of these readings. Chapter 77 has a phrase, '*Kāñcīpīṭhādi tattatpaṭṭaṇa sthāyinīm kṛtvā*' (having established the

lineage at Kāñcī and other cities). A footnote acknowledges that most manuscripts and the earlier Calcutta editions read '*śṛṅgagiri sthānasthām kṛtvā*' (having established the lineage at Śṛṅgeri) instead. Not surprisingly, both manuscripts that provide the new reading are originally from Kāñcīpuram. Veezhinathan justifies his editorial decision in adopting this particular reading by claiming that Śṛṅgeri has already been mentioned in chapter 62, so that there is no need to mention it again in chapter 67 while mentioning Kāñcī is more appropriate.

Veezhinathan divides his manuscripts into two sets based on irreconcilable differences in reading. The preface and numerous footnotes make it clear that he mainly adopts readings found in Kāñcī *maṭha* manuscripts. His edition differs from the two nineteenth-century Calcutta editions in one crucial detail. In these older editions, which are supported by one set of manuscripts, Śaṅkara was born in Cidambaram to a Brāhmaṇī who worshipped the *ākāśaliṅga* (Śiva-*liṅga* named for space) of the temple there with great devotion. In this older version, Śaṅkara's *guru*, Govinda, was already in Cidambaram, and Śaṅkara left the place only after becoming a *saṃnyāsin* to go on tours of religious conquest. The only conclusion that can be drawn from this account is that this text either describes some other Śaṅkara, who is different from the teacher of the Advaita tradition, or that it records a variant tradition about Śaṅkara's birth. In the 1971 text, this Cidambaram version is given only as a footnote in chapter 2 (Veezhinathan 1971: 8). The main narrative follows the second set of manuscripts, describing Śaṅkara's birth at Kālaṭi after his parents had worshipped Śiva at the Trichūr Vṛṣācala temple. Veezhinathan and Mahadevan claim that this is the original, authentic reading and that the version that mentions Cidambaram must be false. The only reason they offer for this is that Acyutarāya's *Advaitarājyalakṣmī* is said to refer to the Kālaṭi reading.[50] If Acyutarāya has specifically referred to Anantānandagiri in this context, he has also referred separately to Ānandagiri elsewhere. This implies that he did not equate the two authors or their texts. Veezhinathan and Mahadevan cannot have it both ways. If Acyutarāya is to be cited in support of adopting the Kālaṭi reading, he cannot also be claimed to support the equation of Anantānandagiri's text with Ānandagiri's text. Moreover, in the 1971 edition, Govinda is still placed in Cidambaram, and Śaṅkara travels from Kālaṭi to Cidambaram to meet his teacher. Mahadevan takes the opportunity to mention that according to the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s *Gururatnamālā* and *Suṣamā*, Gauḍapāda also lived in Cidambaram itself. In his own earlier work on Gauḍapāda, Mahadevan (1960: 12–13) explicitly doubts the reliability of *Gururatnamālā* and *Suṣamā*. However, in his introduction to Veezhinathan's work, he raises no doubt whatsoever. If he has changed his mind about these texts, he does not tell us his reasons for doing so,

and Cidambaram continues to remain central to Veezhinathan's edition of Anantānandagiri's text.

That the Kālaṭi version of Śaṅkara's birth remains problematic for this text is further evident from chapter 3, which compares the infant Śaṅkara to Cidambareśa.[51] In the earlier editions, the boy is born as a result of worshipping Śiva at Cidambaram, and this simile requires no explanation. However, in the 1971 text, since Śaṅkara's parents worship Śiva as Vṛṣācaleśa at Trichūr, the reference to Cidambareśa stands out and calls for an editorial comment. Mahadevan provides one, by claiming that Cidambareśa is a popular name for Śiva throughout the south. He draws attention to a Śiva temple called Ādi-cidambaram at Perūr near Coimbatore and says that the name Perūr is also found in Tiru-śivap-perūr, the full name of Trichūr (Veezhinathan 1971: vii). This is extremely fanciful reasoning that conveniently overlooks temple traditions in Tamilnadu and Kerala.[52] Perūr (Ādi-cidambaram) has a Naṭarāja temple and a Sthālapurāṇa connection to the more famous temple in Cidambaram, while the Trichūr temple has only as much connection to Cidambaram as to any other Śiva temple in southern India. Moreover, in Tamil and Malayalam, the name Perūr simply means 'big town' and may be found in the names of a number of places. Mahadevan fails to explain away the reference to Cidambareśa, having to invoke Cidambaram in a twice-removed fashion. The straightforward explanation is that manuscripts describing Śaṅkara's birth at Cidambaram are probably the only authentic versions of this text. Manuscripts with the Kālaṭi version have probably been tampered with. It should, therefore, be clear that what has been designated a critical edition of the *Anantānandagirīya* is nothing more than a faithful reproduction of the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s latest version of this text.

The yogaliṅga *at Kāñcīpuram*

We have seen that in chapter 65 of the *Anantānandagirīya*, Veezhinathan refers to a text named *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā* in support of a legend of a *yogaliṅga* at Kāñcīpuram. According to his preface, this *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā* has one hundred *kāṇḍas* (sections), each with chapters called *parispandas*. Veezhinathan quotes a few verses that he attributes to the seventh and eighth *parispandas* of the seventy-second *kāṇḍa* but does not give us any other information about this text. Candraśekharendra Sarasvatī (1980) of Kāñcīpuram tells us that this *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā* is part of the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*. However, no edition of the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* includes a section called *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā*, and Śṛṅgeri adherents hold that it is not found in any of the available manuscripts of this Purāṇa either.[53]

Interestingly, Candraśekharendra Sarasvatī (1980: 58–64) says that Śrīharṣa's

Naiṣadhīyacarita, a twelfth-century poem, refers to this *yogaliṅga* in verse 12.38:

> *sindhoḥ jaitramayaṃ pavitram asṛjat tatkīrtipurtādbhutam*
> *yatra snānti jaganti santi kavayaḥ ke vā na vācamyamāḥ.*
> *yadbinduśriyam induḥ añcati jalaṃ ca āviśya dṛśyetaraḥ*
> *yasyāsau jaladevatā sphaṭikabhūḥ jāgarti* yogeśvaraḥ.

The *Naiṣadhīyacarita* is a retelling of the *Mahābhārata* legend of Nala and Damayantī. Candraśekharendra gives the following translation of the above verse:

> This is *yogaliṅga*. Candramaulīśvara is *yogaliṅga*. It is He that is *yogeśvara*. Śrīharṣa refers to Him in this verse. From this it is known that Śrīharṣa had devotion to *yogaliṅga* which was worshipped by Śrī Ācārya. We have already seen that the poet had devotion to Śrī Ācārya and Advaita (1980: 63–64).

We are told that according to this verse, the king of Kāñcīpuram dug a tank filled with clear water that was used for the *abhiṣeka* (ritual bathing during worship) of the *yogaliṅga* worshipped at the Kāñcī *maṭha*. The water in this tank is said to be so pure that the crystal Śiva-*liṅga* becomes invisible when bathed in it. Śrīharṣa is the author of a dialectical treatise named *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍakhādya*, which has inspired a long line of commentaries, so that his status as an Advaita Vedāntin is undisputed. In addition, he is now claimed to have been especially devoted to the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s *yogaliṅga*. The reader is thus expected to infer that a Kāñcī *maṭha* existed in the twelfth century CE and was well known to Śrīharṣa. This is no doubt a very creative exposition, and if correct, it would indeed be early and irrefutable literary evidence with respect to the Kāñcī *maṭha*. The only problem is that Candraśekharendra Sarasvatī's reading of *yogeśvara* is found nowhere in the *Naiṣadhīyacarita*. The last line of the quoted verse actually reads, '*yasyāsau jaladevatā sphaṭikabhūḥ jāgarti* yāgeśvaraḥ' (Śrīharṣa 1952: 504). Is *yogeśvara* an attested variant reading? The evidence of the numerous commentaries says otherwise:

> [Nārāyaṇa:] *asau jaladevatā jāgarti. asau kā?* yā *sphaṭikabhūḥ* ageśvaraḥ *kailāsaḥ jāgarti iti vā....* yāgeśvaraḥ *sphāṭika iti prasiddhiḥ.*

> This deity of water appears [to be invisible]. Who is this deity? It is Kailāsa, the king of the immovables, who is made of crystal....It is well known that *yāgeśvara* means [a Śiva-*liṅga*] made of crystal.

[Candupaṇḍita:] yā *sphaṭikabhūḥ kailāsaḥ* agānāṃ *parvatānām* īśvaraḥ. *tatra api jaladevatā* yāgānām īśvaraḥ yajñapuruṣaḥ adṛśyaḥ.

Kailāsa, the king of the immovable mountains, made of crystal. There too, the deity of water, the lord of sacrifices, the person of the sacrifice, is invisible.

[Vidyādhara:] *eṣaḥ sphaṭikabhūḥ kailāsagiriḥ eva* yā *jaladevatā* ageśvaraḥ *jāgarti sphurati...udakaṃ ca āviśya praviśya* dṛśyetarā adṛśyā.

Upon entering the water,...this Kailāsa Mountain, made of crystal, the king of immovables, appears...to be other than visible, that is, invisible.

[Īśānadeva:] *yasya* kīrtitaḍāgasya *asau sphaṭikabhūḥ kailāsagiriḥ eva* yāgeśvaraḥ *maheśvaraḥ jaladevatā jāgarti...*dṛśyetarā adṛśyā.

Of the tank of glory, this Kailāsa Mountain itself, made of crystal, the lord of sacrifices, the great god, the deity of water, appears...other than visible, invisible.

[Jinarāja:] *yasya* kīrtipūrtasya jalam *āviśya praviśya* dṛśyetarā *adṛśyā satī jāgarti....*yāgeśvara *śabdena sphaṭikanirmita śivaliṅgam iti.*

Entering the tank filled with the water of glory, it appears to be invisible....The word *yāgeśvara* refers to a Śiva-*liṅga* made of crystal.

[Mallinātha:] *sphaṭikodbhavati iti sphaṭikabhūḥ sphaṭikodbhavaḥ* yāgeśvaraḥ *san jāgarti. sphaṭikaliṅge* yāgeśvara *iti prasiddhiḥ.*

Being made of crystal, the lord of sacrifices appears [to be invisible]. A crystal *liṅga* is well known as *yāgeśvara.*

Not a single commentator reads *yogeśvara.* Three analyze the word *yāgeśvaraḥ* as *yā* + *ageśvaraḥ* (a simple *sandhi*), the reference being to Kailāsa, the king of mountains, the abode of Śiva. This is certainly not a moveable *sphaṭikaliṅga* at Kāñcī. Rama Sastri (1976: 61) objects that the pronoun *yā* is feminine while the noun *ageśvaraḥ* is masculine, so that the word cannot be split in this fashion. This objection is quite invalid, as, in this case, *yā* refers not to *ageśvaraḥ* but to *jaladevatā,* which is grammatically a feminine word. Three different commentators mix linguistic gender in a related way, by reading

dṛśyetarā and *adṛśyā*, aligned with *yā* and *jaladevatā*, instead of *dṛśyetaraḥ* and *adṛśyaḥ*, which go with the word *ageśvaraḥ*. Candupaṇḍita is even more specific in his alternative explanation. The words *yajñapuruṣa* and *yāgānām īśvara* (a *tatpuruṣa samāsa*) show that the reading is definitely *yāgeśvara* (lord of sacrifices) and not *yogeśvara* (lord of *yoga*). Note also that according to Nārāyaṇa, Jinarāja, and Mallinātha, *any* crystal Śiva-*liṅga* is generally called *yāgeśvara*.[54] There is no reason to suppose that the poet intended to refer to a specific one in this verse.

Moreover, the verse really says nothing about the king of Kāñcī digging an actual water tank. The water and the tank are both metaphorical. The 'clear water' in this verse consists of the king's glory (*kīrti*), which is so great that a tank filled with it (*kīrtipūrta*) would rival the ocean in its extent. A mere drop of this metaphorical water is comparable to the moon, and *yāgeśvara*, the *jaladevatā*, made of *sphaṭika*, would disappear when immersed in it. All this is poetic praise of the king's greatness. Converting a metaphorical tank filled with the water of the king's glory to a material water tank violates the basic poetic intention. More prosaically speaking, converting *yāgeśvara* to *yogeśvara* constitutes an ill-conceived attempt at deliberate textual tampering.

That Veezhinathan quotes from an unavailable *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā* and includes the story about the *yogaliṅga* in his edition of Anantānandagiri's text may be understood in terms of his devotion to the Kāñcī *maṭha* and its leadership. Strangely enough, Pande (1994: 369) also does not bother to investigate the so-called *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā* and simply repeats the *yogaliṅga* story as found in Kāñcī publications. On the one hand, he acknowledges that all the manuscripts of and commentators on *Naiṣadhīyacarita* unanimously give the *yāgeśvara* reading. There is absolutely no textual basis for reading *yogeśvara*. Nevertheless, Pande simply accepts the special claim of the Kāñcī *maṭha* regarding this supposedly early reference to its *yogaliṅga*, on the grounds that the poetic metaphor requires an actual Śiva-*liṅga* and an actual water tank. All that is required for Śrīharṣa's metaphor is that a crystal Śiva-*liṅga* becomes invisible when immersed in water. *Any* crystal Śiva-*liṅga* and *any* body of water would satisfy this purpose. Indeed, Nārāyaṇa, the first commentator cited above, describes this as a well known general test for the quality of the crystal. Pande also does not take into account that the verse in question praises one of Damayantī's suitors, who is a king of Kāñcīpuram, not the ascetic head of a monastery in that city. The claim that Śrīharṣa refers to a specific *yogaliṅga* that was worshipped at the Kāñcī *maṭha* by Śaṅkara has no basis in the poem. Indeed, it is contradicted by the attested reading of *yāgeśvara* and by the commentators who explain the verse with no reference to Śaṅkara or to a *maṭha* at Kāñcīpuram.

The issue of four mahāvākyas

This brings me to an examination of another tradition unique to the Kāñcī *maṭha*, but only because Mahadevan and Veezhinathan go out of their way to draw attention to it. It is generally said that there are four *mahāvākyas* used at the time of *upadeśa* (initiation) into *saṃnyāsa*. The standard four sentences are *prajñānam brahma*, *aham brahma asmi*, *tat tvam asi*, and *ayam ātmā brahma*, one each taken from the principal Upaniṣads of the four Vedas. The *mahāvākyas* lie at the heart of Daśanāmī tradition. In Advaita Vedānta, a 'great sentence' is a *śruti vākya* that teaches the fundamental identity of the *jīvātman* with Brahman. There are many sentences that state or imply this equation, but the crucial issue for a *guru-śiṣya* lineage pertains to the sentences used for *upadeśa* during *saṃnyāsa* initiation.[55] The Kāñcī *maṭha* disagrees with the tradition that these are four in number and claims that its own *mahāvākya* is *oṃ tat sat* (Pande 1994: 358). However, the *Bhagavad Gītā* says that the words *oṃ*, *tat*, and *sat* each directly denote Brahman;[56] thus the others in the tradition do not accept that a collection of synonymous terms makes a *mahāvākya*.

A footnote in Mahadevan's (Veezhinathan 1971: viii) introduction brings up this controversy about the number of *mahāvākyas*. Mahadevan claims that in the independent text named *Pañcīkaraṇa*, Śaṅkara lists only three *mahāvākyas* and uses the term '*ityādi*,' implying many more such sentences. However, *Pañcīkaraṇa* concludes, '*tat tvam asi, brahma aham asmi, prajñānam ānandaṃ brahma, ayam ātmā brahma, ityādi vākyebhyaḥ*' (through such sentences as, 'You are that,' 'I am Brahman,' 'Consciousness and bliss is Brahman,' and 'This self is Brahman') (Sundaresan 2002: 26). There are four sentences specifically listed here, not three. Except for the variant readings in two of these, these are identical to the four standard *upadeśa mahāvākyas*. Clearly, the *Pañcīkaraṇa* text also indicates the importance of these four sentences for the Advaita *saṃnyāsa* tradition.[57] Mahadevan's claim that only three such sentences are specifically listed in the *Pañcīkaraṇa* is extremely mystifying, to say the least.

In a footnote to chapter 41, Veezhinathan (1971: 145) holds that *oṃ tat sat* is a *mahāvākya*. He holds that the four *mahāvākya* theory is refuted by the fact that one usually studies only one Vedic *śākhā* (branch). Apparently, *aham brahma asmi*, which is from the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (*Śukla Yajurveda*), cannot be a *mahāvākya* for monks of Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda schools. If such exclusivity is part of the tradition, Veezhinathan must accuse even Śaṅkara of having violated it because Śaṅkara wrote commentaries on Upaniṣads of all four Vedas and emphasized *tat tvam asi*, the *Sāma Veda mahāvākya*. Veezhinathan then proceeds to claim that *oṃ* is a *mahāvākya* all by itself and that *tat sat* is also an independent *mahāvākya* because *tat* denotes Brahman while *sat* denotes the

individual *jīva*. That *oṃ* is a *mahāvākya* is contradicted directly by *śruti* and *smṛti*.[58] As for Veezhinathan's claim that *sat* denotes the *jīva*, this is contrary to both the Upaniṣads and the noted writers of Advaita texts. In *Upadeśasāhasrī*, Śaṅkara uses *sat* directly to denote Brahman. In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, the word *sat* denotes the highest Brahman, not the individual *jīva*. In this scriptural text, Uddālaka defines *sat* as Brahman, the One cause, and then equates that (*tat*) Brahman (*sat*) with the word *tvam*. In Advaita Vedānta, this is explained by explicitly sacrificing the usually assumed referents of *tvam* (as transmigrator) and *sat* or *tat* (as Brahman with attributes), so as to arrive at a fundamental identity. Veezhinathan's stance that *sat* denotes only the *jīva* literally contradicts scripture and also the Advaita tradition of its exegesis.

Moreover, the four specific *mahāvākya*s have acquired special significance within the Daśanāmī tradition in the context of initiation. The *saṃnyāsa* manuals provide an option for using any one or all four *mahāvākya*s, but Daśanāmī tradition also associates these four sentences with the four *āmnāya maṭha*s. This is probably based on nothing more than the fact that each of these sets has four elements. In any case, in the Advaita tradition, the *mahāvākya*s are *śruti* sentences specifically related to *saṃnyāsa*. On the other hand, *oṃ tat sat* is from the *Bhagavad Gītā*, which for all its importance as *smṛti* is not *śruti*. Veezhinathan seems to realize that this remains a serious problem. Although he argues in favor of *oṃ tat sat* in his footnote, he does not include it in the main text. Instead, in chapter 41, he inserts '*neha nānāsti kiṃcana*' (no diversity whatsoever exists here) in parentheses after the four traditionally enumerated *mahāvākya*s. This sentence is not found in the Calcutta editions, and Veezhinathan is silent about the manuscript evidence for this reading. Chapter 41 of Anantānandagiri's text now presents a highly curious situation in which the main text parenthetically includes a fifth sentence in the form of '*neha nānāsti kiṃcana*,' which is a *śruti* sentence, but the corresponding footnote argues for the entirely different *oṃ tat sat*, which is a *smṛti* phrase.[59] More confusion follows. The very next sentence in Anantānandagiri's text refers to the *mahāvākya-catuṣṭaya* in the context of *upadeśa*, indicating that the original author intended only the well-known set of four sentences. This is further confirmed by an explicit reference to the *Śukarahasya Upaniṣad*, a text that lists the standard four *mahāvākya*s.[60] Undoubtedly, the original text of *Anantānandagirīya* must have listed only the same four sentences, leaving no room for either *oṃ tat sat* or *neha nānāsti kiṃcana*.[61]

While Veezhinathan's arguments can be criticized on traditional grounds, it should also be clear that he and Mahadevan have failed in their stated project of producing a critical edition of this hagiographic text. The editor and his advisor have quite unjustifiably tampered with the text in order to suit their political

purposes. The Kāñcī *maṭha* may have its own reasons for attempting to develop a new tradition regarding the *mahāvākya*s, but these two scholars have succeeded only in refuting the most probable original reading of the *Anantānandagirīya*. This is a singular disservice, both to the old tradition of Advaita Vedānta that they claim to uphold and to the new tradition of critical scholarship that they claim to represent at the University of Madras.

THE *ŚAṄKARAVIJAYA* OF MĀDHAVA

The *Śaṅkaravijaya* of Mādhava is quite well known and has been discussed in some detail by David Lorenzen (1983) and Natalia Isayeva (1993). Also known as the *Saṃkṣepa Śaṅkarajaya*, it has been printed and translated many times. It is very popular within the Advaita tradition and portions of it are recited during annual Śaṅkara Jayanti celebrations. The author is usually identified with Vidyāraṇya, and the text has come to be known as the *Śaṅkaravijaya* of Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya.[62] Antarkar (1972) mentions that he has seen very old, complete palmleaf manuscripts and smaller extracts from this work, which is uniformly attributed to Mādhava, from libraries all over India. He notes that wandering religious preachers like the *kīrtanakāra*s rely solely on this text. However, for various reasons that will be reexamined below, he concludes that this text dates from much later times and that its author should not be identified with Vidyāraṇya.

The commentaries to this text help in fixing its latest possible date. Dhanapatisūrin's *Ḍiṇḍima* informs us that it was completed in 1798 CE[63] while Acyutarāya's *Advaitarājyalakṣmī* was written in 1824. Thus, a definitive text of the *Mādhavīya* was fixed before the early nineteenth century. This has generally been taken to be the last possible date for the *Mādhavīya* (Lorenzen 1983; Sawai 1992), but it seems likely that this text was composed at an earlier date. Sadānanda's *Śaṅkaravijaya Sāra* was written in 1783 CE (Aiyar and Venkataraman 1977: 63), and according to *Dundubhi* (Dhanapatisūrin's commentary on this text), Sadānanda mainly follows Mādhava's account. This indicates that Mādhava's text must have been well accepted wi*thin the tradition even before 1783. These dates assume importance in light of an early twentieth-century controversy over the Mādhavīya*. Narayana Sastri (1916) holds that the Ānandāśrama edition (1891) of this text was printed hastily, with alterations prepared by a Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* adherent so as to highlight Śṛṅgeri's importance over Kāñcī. He traces the motivation for this to a dispute between the Śṛṅgeri and Kumbhakoṇam-Kāñcī *maṭha*s in 1845. Narayana Sastri claims that the

Kumbhakoṇam *maṭha* relied on *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā* and *Śivarahasya* but that Śṛṅgeri could produce nothing, so the *Mādhavīya* was produced as a late response. Relying on extended hearsay, he also identifies the author as one Bhaṭṭaśrī Nārāyaṇa Śāstrī, who lived in the late nineteenth century. The name Mādhava is claimed as a pseudonym of Nārāyaṇa (Antarkar 1972: 22–23; Narayana Sastri 1916: 158–67; Tapasyānanda 1980: ix–xiii).

The above claims essentially mean that the *Mādhavīya* was either entirely written or significantly altered at the behest of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* around 1891, that is, a full century after Dhanapatisūrin wrote his commentary on this text. Antarkar notes these objections, but refers to the old manuscripts of the text and the date of the commentary, to conclude: 'We have therefore, to set aside the charge against *S. Ś. Jaya* of Mādhava as unproved and even disproved by evidence to the contrary' (1972: 5). This is a strong statement about the age of this text that essentially dismisses Narayana Sastri's claims. Yet, in his concluding remarks, Antarkar contradicts his own earlier stand and says, 'It is quite possible that it was tampered with by Bhaṭṭaśrī Nārāyaṇa Śāstrī' (1972: 22). The only reason he offers for this reversal is that another *paṇḍita* named Bāla Śāstrī, whom Antarkar regards as a great scholar, accepts Narayana Sastri's claims. Thus, he disregards concrete evidence provided by the commentaries and old, complete manuscripts from many different parts of India in favor of one person's opinion, based on his own estimate of that person's greatness. Antarkar admits that all printed editions of this text agree with one another and with the manuscripts to a remarkable extent. The 1891 Ānandāśrama edition includes both commentaries to this text. Sengaku Mayeda's (1992: 7) list also includes an earlier edition from Bombay. Although a critical edition of this text has not been published, it should be noted that editions published directly from Śṛṅgeri also do not differ from these earlier editions.[64] The allegation that this text was substantially altered in the late nineteenth century cannot be upheld. Antarkar does not stop to consider that if the *Mādhavīya* had been tampered with in the interests of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*, the text published from Śṛṅgeri might differ from the other independent editions and manuscripts, at least in some details.

All of Narayana Sastri's objections to the *Mādhavīya* emanate from his assertion that the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* needed to produce some text, having lost a lawsuit against the Kumbhakoṇam-Kāñcī *maṭha* in 1845. Publications from the two *maṭhas* present very different accounts of the outcome of this case. The correct judicial details are probably available in legal records,[65] but the textual claims are more relevant here. Narayana Sastri claims that during the proceedings, the Kumbhakoṇam-Kāñcī *maṭha* quoted *Śivarahasya* and *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā*. Various versions of a *Śivarahasya* are available, but I have already pointed out that the *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā* is completely untraceable. Antarkar

does not ask his Kāñcī sources for details about these texts. Besides, the Śṛṅgeri *Guruvaṃśakāvya* had been written more than a century before this dispute arose, while the *Mādhavīya* itself had gained sufficient importance to have influenced Sadānanda and to have been commented upon by Dhanapatisūrin and Acyutarāya many decades earlier. Antarkar's clear indebtedness to Kāñcī *maṭha paṇḍitas* results in a self-contradictory stance on the allegation that Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* followers greatly altered the text in the late nineteenth century.

Large numbers of verses in the *Mādhavīya* (about two-thirds of the available text) are also found in Vyāsācala's *Śaṅkaravijaya*, Tirumala Dīkṣita's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya*, Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya*, and Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita's *Patañjalicarita*. There is no unanimity about the exact number of common verses in each case, but some of these are identical reproductions of one another, while others have variant readings. It is well known that the last two poets lived in the seventeenth century and that Vidyāraṇya lived in the fourteenth century. Antarkar (1972: 22) argues that it is *Mādhavīya* that has borrowed extensively from the texts of Vyāsācala and the three Dīkṣitas. He concludes that one Mādhava Bhaṭṭa, the author of a *Bhārata Campū*, must have put together this text some time after the seventeenth century. Rama Sastri (1976: 55–56) makes the same argument and says that in addition to the texts attributed to Vyāsācala, Rāmabhadra, and Rājacūḍāmaṇi, *Mādhavīya* borrows forty verses from a *Bhagavatpādasaptati* of a Jagannāthakavi and an unspecified number of verses from another *Bhagavatpādasaptati* of one Umāmaheśvara Śāstrī.[66] However, Rama Sastri offers no reasons for this assertion. R. K. Aiyar and K. R. Venkataraman (1977: 37–43) hold that the borrowing is really in the opposite direction. They maintain that the *Mādhavīya* was commented upon and published much before any of these other texts came to light and that Kāñcī *maṭha* followers have heavily tampered with these works by inserting into them numerous verses taken from the *Mādhavīya*. Both Kāñcī and Śṛṅgeri sources remain silent about Tirumala's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya*. For his part, Antarkar does not inform us whether the *Mādhavīya Śaṅkaravijaya* shares any common features with the *Bhārata Campū* of Mādhava Bhaṭṭa, nor does he give other reasons for identifying this particular author.[67] He tells us nothing more about this *Bhārata Campū* or any other works of Mādhava Bhaṭṭa, nor does he thoroughly investigate the authorship of the texts claimed to be sources of the *Mādhavīya*. It is one thing to say that the *Mādhavīya* is a composite text and quite another to say that a specific person borrowed extensively from numerous other texts. The first alternative allows for a text that has grown over the centuries through well-known processes of textual accretion, but Antarkar holds that the *Mādhavīya* is merely a product of deliberate and cunning plagiarism.

Much of Antarkar's argument about the direction of borrowing is based upon

stylistic criteria and the variety of poetic meters found in the text. However, Tapasyānanda (1980) praises the poetic value of the text and views its usage of a variety of meters as a positive literary feature. An analysis of poetic style and meters is outside the scope of this paper. Here I review some of Antarkar's other objections against this text before discussing the texts attributed to Vyāsācala and others. Antarkar never sees fit to extend the same concessions to the *Mādhavīya* that he does to the *Anantānandagirīya*. In contrast to his defense of the latter text, claiming that stylistic criteria are subjective and inconclusive, he criticizes the former text on stylistic grounds. He finds fault with *Mādhavīya* for not being a literally factual account but defends *Anantānandagirīya* by appealing to telepathy, clairvoyance, and parapsychology. Antarkar (1972: 20) claims that the *Mādhavīya* account of Śaṅkara's debate with Maṇḍana Miśra depicts both of them in a negative light,[68] although many within the Daśanāmī tradition find it to be rather well written. His criticism that Mādhava describes the same individual as an incarnation of different gods is just a quibble, for Mādhava explicitly tells us that he is reporting different traditions.[69] Antarkar finds another problem in Mādhava's description of how Śaṅkara identified himself as the one Śiva, independent of all attributes, when first meeting Govinda, his teacher.[70] Antarkar's apparent disappointment at not finding a servile attitude of the disciple towards the *guru* betrays a highly deficient understanding of both the philosophy of Advaita and its living *saṃnyāsin* tradition. According to all accounts, Śaṅkara was a boy of extraordinary ability, who had already assumed the vows of *saṃnyāsa* and only then gone in search of a preceptor.[71] The *Mādhavīya* simply emphasizes that even before he met Govinda, Śaṅkara had already realized the real *ātman*, which is *śānta*, *śiva*, and *advaita*. Consistent with this outlook, tradition also recounts that when Hastāmalaka first met Śaṅkara, he identified himself as the ever-present *ātman*, and Śaṅkara took him on as a disciple because he immediately realized that this was not an ordinary boy.[72] In *Upadeśasāhasrī*, Śaṅkara has a student introduce himself as a Brāhmaṇa, with family background and other details. The teacher tells the student that this is an error and that he is really the eternal *ātman*, never limited by any attributes, including caste, family, and purificatory ceremonies (Mayeda 1992: 214–15). Even today, after the *saṃnyāsa* initiation, *gurus* address their disciples as *svāmin*, and the relationship between preceptor and disciple matures into one of equality, mutual respect, and regard. A little knowledge of the philosophy and ethos of the tradition shows that Antarkar's criticism of the *Mādhavīya* is highly misguided.

Another instance of unwarranted faultfinding with the *Mādhavīya* is Antarkar's reference to the composition of subcommentaries to Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya*s. He says that in Mādhava's account, Śaṅkara is not very particular about what sort of

subcommentary he wanted to be written on his own works. According to him, Mādhava uses the terms *vṛtti*, *vārttika*, and *ṭīkā* interchangeably. Thus, he finds Mādhava to be guilty either of inconsistent usage or of ignorance of the specific technical connotations of these terms.[73] However, even a casual reading of the *Mādhavīya* shows otherwise. Toward the end of chapter 7, Śaṅkara meets Kumārila, hoping to get that renowned scholar to comment upon his work. In verse 103 of this chapter, Kumārila mentions a *vṛtti*, but in verse 107, Śaṅkara suggests that he should write a *vārttika*. Accordingly, in verse 118, Kumārila uses the word *vārttika*. Similarly, in chapter 13, Sureśvara first proposes to write a *vṛtti* on Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, but Śaṅkara tells him to write a *vārttika*, following which Sureśvara consistently uses the word *vārttika*. According to this story, other disciples are either suspicious or jealous of Sureśvara and propose that Padmapāda should write a *ṭīkā* on the *Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya*, while Padmapāda suggests that Hastāmalaka should do so. To settle this problem, Śaṅkara decides that Sureśvara should write a completely independent treatise first and that Padmapāda should comment upon the *Brahma-sūtrabhāṣya*. Accordingly, Sureśvara writes *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*, and Padmapāda writes *Pañcapādikā*. In this account, only Kumārila and Sureśvara use the word *vṛtti*, but Śaṅkara wants them to write a *vārttika* on his own commentary. He changes his plan only to resolve a conflict among his disciples, who refer to a *ṭīkā*.[74] Antarkar seems to cavil against the *Mādhavīya*, seeing contradictions where none exist.

Antarkar (1972: 2) thinks that the salutation of Vidyā Tīrtha in the first verse of the *Mādhavīya* is spurious; thus he disregards the commentators when they identify the author as Vidyāraṇya. However, he relies on the same first verse and its commentaries when he holds that Mādhava himself refers to Ānandagiri's so-called *Prācīna Śaṅkaravijaya* (Antarkar 1960: 114, 1972: 2). This is a self-contradictory assessment of this verse. He then rejects Narayana Sastri's contention that this text was manipulated in the late nineteenth century, yet he proceeds to contradict himself once again by accepting it after all, in spite of strong evidence to the contrary. He claims that this *Śaṅkaravijaya* is a result of plagiarism by one Mādhava Bhaṭṭa but thinks that this person possessed sufficient poetic talent to write his own *Bhārata Campū*. He then adds Tirumala Dīkṣita's text to three of the six texts found in Rama Sastri's list, bringing the total number of claimed sources of the *Mādhavīya* to seven. These texts have thus steadily increased in number, although most of them have remained obscure. The two *Bhagavatpādasaptati* texts seem to have never been published, and we have only Rama Sastri's assertion that the *Mādhavīya* borrows from them. Except for Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita's poem, which has no more than fifteen verses in common with the *Mādhavīya*, none of these works was published before the

twentieth century. In contrast, the *Mādhavīya* has been widely available for more than two centuries now. It has merited a commentary in the late eighteenth century, another in the early nineteenth century, and repeated publication by independent institutions. The texts that account for about 90 percent of the supposed borrowing have only been unearthed recently, and they have undeniably close connections to the Kāñcī *maṭha*. Tirumala is claimed to have been a disciple of Paramaśivendra Sarasvatī, who has been included in the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s list, and Ānandagiri and Vyāsācala are also claimed to have been at Kāñcī.[75] No manuscripts of Ānandagiri's *Prācīna Śaṅkarajaya* and Citsukha's *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya* are available, but Antarkar (1960) believes the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s 'reliable information' about them. Nothing more has been heard of Citsukha's text, while Rama Sastri (1976: 29, 59) attributes a *Prācīna Śaṅkaravijaya* to Ānandagiri in one place and to Mūkakavi in another. Mahadevan and Veezhinathan claim that Anantānandagiri's text is the same as Ānandagiri's *Śaṅkaravijaya*. However, as there is nothing in common between *Anantanāndagirīya* and *Mādhavīya*, Mādhava's own reference to a *Prācīna Śaṅkarajaya* cannot be to Anantānandagiri's text. Antarkar says nothing about this and seems to be more interested in endorsing the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s rejection of this text than in an impartial comparative analysis. The following discussion shows that the direction of borrowing of common material is not as conclusively evident as Antarkar presents it.

The Śaṅkaravijaya *of Vyāsācala*

The Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, published a *Śaṅkaravijaya* attributed to a Vyāsācala (Chandrasekharan 1954), with about twelve hundred verses in twelve chapters. Antarkar (1972: 5–8) holds that Mādhava borrows four hundred seventy-five verses from this work. Rama Sastri (1976: 55) mentions five hundred verses, while Aiyar and Venkataraman (1977: 47–48) say that there are about six hundred common verses. The editor of the 1954 text says that *Mādhavīya* refers to this particular text in one verse,[76] which is found in an Oriental Library manuscript. Antarkar informs us that one Mahādeva Śāstrī also gave him another verse, attributing both verses to the first chapter of the *Mādhavīya*. Antarkar infers, 'at least tentatively,' that the second verse may also be found in the same Madras manuscript.[77] Neither verse is found in any printed edition of the *Mādhavīya*, and the two commentators do not notice them at all. Rama Sastri (1976: 56) suggests that both verses were originally present in the *Mādhavīya* but that they have been deliberately omitted from the printed editions because of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*'s influence. The 1798 date of Dhanapatisūrin's commentary argues against this contention as well. *Mādhavīya* seems to have

been available to various authors all over India at least before the end of the eighteenth century, and printed editions are admitted to match remarkably well with manuscripts of this text. Only the Madras manuscript has an extra verse: whether it has Mahādeva Śāstrī's second verse is open to question. In the absence of text-critical apparatus, no reliable information is available about the history of manuscript transmission. The 1954 edition of Vyāsācala's text offers another instance of verses that are not found in the corresponding manuscripts. A pasted postscript to the preface informs us that after the text was printed and bound, Rama Sastri handed over to the editor four additional verses extracted from the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s *Suṣamā* and attributed to the *Vyāsācalīya*. These verses have been included in the postscript but not in the main text, and the editor clarifies that they were not found in any of his source manuscripts, including those obtained from the Kāñcī *maṭha*. It is not very surprising that these four additional verses describe Śaṅkara's last days at Kāñcī and his establishment of a *maṭha* there. Note that the main text places Śaṅkara's last days in the Himālayas and says nothing about any *maṭha*s.

Who is this Vyāsācala? The published text gives no clue to the author's identity, but the editor's preface quotes one Atreya Kṛṣṇa Śāstrī (another Kāñcī *maṭha paṇḍita*) and identifies Vyāsācala with a Mahādevendra Sarasvatī, one of the heads of the Kāñcī *maṭha* who performed penance on a hill named Vyāsācala. The location of this hill is unknown, and no such story about any of the Mahādevendra Sarasvatīs on the Kāñcī list is to be found in that *maṭha*'s *Gururatnamālā* or *Suṣamā*. Kṛṣṇa Śāstrī's reasons for identifying Vyāsācala with a Mahādevendra Sarasvatī remain mysterious. A different identification of this Vyāsācala had earlier been made by the Kāñcī *maṭha*; Narayana Sastri (1916) had identified Vyāsācala with either Vidyāśaṅkara or Śaṅkarānanda (Antarkar 1960: 113). Now, unlike the references available uniquely to Kāñcī *maṭha paṇḍitas*, *Mādhavīya* (1.17) does refer to a Vyāsācala. However, both Dhanapatisūrin and Acyutarāya interpret this as a self-descriptive term used by the author and equate Vyāsācala with Mādhava (Antarkar 1972: 2). Neither commentator sees this as a reference to another author named Vyāsācala who wrote a different text. Aiyar and Venkataraman (1977: 47–64) offer other evidence, which indicates that Govindanātha's *Śaṅkarācāryacarita* (the *Keralīya Śaṅkaravijaya*) also identifies Vyāsācala with Mādhava. Even the author of the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s *Suṣamā* seems to refer only to the *Mādhavīya* in one of his supposed quotations from a *Vyāsācalīya*. Thus, he mentions the Cāṇḍāla episode,[78] with the introduction, '*vistṛtam idam vyāsācalīye*' (This is elaborated in the *Vyāsācalīya*), and quotes twenty-eight verses which are completely identical in wording and order to *Mādhavīya* 6.25–52. Manuscripts attributed to Vyāsācala do not describe the Cāṇḍāla episode at all, and none of these twenty-

eighth verses is found in the 1954 publication. Another such instance is found in reference to Śaṅkara's *upanayana* (sacred-thread investiture) ceremony, where *Suṣamā* refers to a *Vyāsācalīya* but quotes *Mādhavīya* (4.11). The corresponding verse in the 1954 *Vyāsācalīya* text (11.116) has a different reading.[79] Thus, there is sufficient reason to question whether there was any independent author named Vyāsācala. Antarkar disregards all this, and on the strength of the two stanzas not found in the vast majority of manuscripts, he says, 'Mādhava definitely refers to Vyāsācala in the stanzas *vyāsācala pramukha pūrvika*' (1972: 9). Again, he trusts the oral evidence of a Kāñcī *maṭha paṇḍita* and his own 'tentative' inference against the evidence of the numerous manuscripts of the *Mādhavīya* and the commentaries. As is now a consistent pattern with him where Kāñcī sources are concerned, he adduces no reasons. The *Mādhavīya* can be accused of plagiarism only if Vyāsācala is proved to be a completely different author. However, such a supposition rests on two verses of highly suspect origins. In his eagerness to judge the *Mādhavīya* adversely, Antarkar does not investigate the 1954 *Vyāsācalīya* properly, and he considers no alternative explanations of the textual evidence. The entire exercise smacks of specious reasoning, designed as an explanation for a prejudiced conclusion about these texts.

One criterion that Antarkar uses to decide the direction of borrowing is that the *Mādhavīya* gives more stories than the other works and elaborates more on the common ones. Such an argument would actually work more effectively against the text attributed to Vyāsācala. For example, *Mādhavīya* (2.46–47) refers to the legend of Upamanyu when Śaṅkara's parents decide to propitiate Śiva in order to obtain a son. The story continues with the parents worshipping Śiva at Trichūr. In the published *Vyāsācalīya*, both these verses are found towards the end of the first chapter. The next two chapters, containing one hundred and thirty-nine verses, describe the story of Upamanyu in great detail, and Śaṅkara's birth is described only in the fourth chapter. The use of two entire chapters out of twelve to digress from the main narrative stands out very significantly. Similarly, in *Mādhavīya* (16.14–15), Śaṅkara's disciples are described as having gone on a search for doctors in order to treat Śaṅkara when he was ill. The 1954 text has both these verses as 10.12 and 10.17, but quite irrelevantly, the intervening four verses describe the beauty of sunrise and sunset. In verse 10.18, the disciples soon forget their mission. The text then begins describing the Sahyādri Mountains, the ocean, the spring season, and the erotic sentiments it arouses in young lovers. Chapter 11 continues with a description of all the seasons that follow in order, until, in verse 11.78, we are told that the disciples eventually returned with the doctors. Apparently, it took more than a year for the disciples to find competent doctors; meanwhile they took a vacation, enjoying seasonal delights and various other sensuous

pleasures, quite oblivious to the state of Śaṅkara's health! Hagiographies usually intend to glorify, but one hundred and seventeen verses in chapter 10 and seventy-seven verses in chapter 11 of the 1954 text of Vyāsācala are not only irrelevant to Śaṅkara's life, but they also cast his disciples in an extremely poor light. Contrast this with the *Mādhavīya*, where three verses (16.14–16) give the whole story. This is definitely the simpler treatment of the episode. It may be said that lyrical descriptions of the seasons and the beauty of nature are standard features of *kāvya* literature and that *Mādhavīya* describes Śaṅkara's travels similarly. However, the context in which such descriptions have been introduced in the 1954 text of Vyāsācala is hardly appropriate. And if greater elaboration of stories indicates a specific direction of borrowing, a very strong case can be made that it is the text published in 1954 and attributed to Vyāsācala that has borrowed extensively from the *Mādhavīya*, embellishing and elaborating a few selected accounts. Finally, these two examples themselves fill almost four chapters out of twelve, utilizing three hundred and thirty-three out of a total of twelve hundred verses (28 percent).[80] It is therefore more than a little astounding to read Antarkar's (1972: 8) opinion of the matter, when he contends that Vyāsācala's text is more cryptic in both style and arrangement than Mādhava's text.

The Śaṅkarābhyudaya *of Tirumala Dīkṣita*

Antarkar (1965) published Tirumala Dīkṣita's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya*, using a transcript from the Oriental Research Institute, Mysore, which is said to possess the sole manuscript of this text. The text seems to be incomplete, as it ends abruptly after Śaṅkara's debate with Maṇḍana Miśra, but is claimed to be the source of four hundred and seventy-five verses in the *Mādhavīya*. The most serious problem with Antarkar's analysis of this text is his dating. Each chapter colophon salutes one Paramaśivendra Sarasvatī. Antarkar, who has thrown out Mādhava's verse salutation of Vidyā Tīrtha as spurious, does not look deeper into Tirumala colophon reference. The Kāñcī *maṭha* claims Paramaśivendra as its head between 1539 and 1586 CE. Antarkar accepts this date and concludes that Tirumala Dīkṣita must have also lived in the sixteenth century. However, this is at least a century too early. Paramaśivendra's *Daharavidyā Prakāśikā* (1991) mentions one Tryambakarāya Makhin, a minister of the Tañjāvūr Marāṭhā kings, Śāhajī (1684–1711) and Serfojī I (1711–29). Śāhajī's grant to Veṅkaṭakṛṣṇa Dīkṣita, one of Paramaśivendra's disciples, carries a date of 1692 CE. Sadāśiva Brahmendra, a more famous disciple, was contemporaneous with Tukojī (1729– 36) of Tañjāvūr and Vijayaraghunātha Toṇḍaimān (1730–69) of Pudukkoṭṭai (Sewell 1975). Paramaśivendra Sarasvatī's date is definitely later

than 1675 CE, and this Tirumala Dīkṣita, if he was indeed Paramaśivendra's direct disciple, should have lived around 1700 CE.

Antarkar acknowledges that old and complete manuscripts of the *Mādhavīya* exist, although he does not tell us how old the oldest one is. Let us assume that he is right about the direction of borrowing between the *Mādhavīya* and this *Śaṅkarābhyudaya*, if not about the date of the latter. We may now hypothetically reconstruct the origins of the former text. One Mādhava Bhaṭṭa borrows heavily from various texts to produce the text that is now called the *Mādhavīya*. No manuscript of Mādhava's text can be much older than 1700 CE, which must also be the earliest possible date for this Mādhava Bhaṭṭa. We must now allow for a reasonable period of time over which manuscripts of Mādhava's compilation are copied and widely distributed all over India. In some mysterious manner, the *Mādhavīya* then gets attributed to Vidyāraṇya and quickly becomes very popular among traveling religious preachers (*kīrtanakāras*) and learned Daśanāmī *saṃnyāsins* all over India. Thus, Sadānanda relies upon it in 1783 when he composes his *Śaṅkaravijaya Sāra*, and a commentary is written upon it in 1798.[81] Even as the *Mādhavīya* gains in popularity, Tirumala Dīkṣita, a disciple of such a notable *guru* as Paramaśivendra Sarasvatī, is very much alive. Still, his work is eclipsed effectively by a plagiarized compilation that borrows substantially from him. Tirumala's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* is disregarded so totally that only one incomplete manuscript of his work survives. Dhanapatisūrin also remains quite unaware of it, although he is sufficiently interested in the hagiographic literature to write commentaries on two different texts, the *Mādhavīya* and the *Śaṅkaravijaya Sāra*.

In my opinion, this could have only happened via a fantastic conspiracy on the part of this Mādhava Bhaṭṭa and the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*, and also perhaps Sadānanda and Dhanapatisūrin, against Paramaśivendra Sarasvatī and his disciples. However, every traditional Advaitin, including the recent heads of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*, has always held Paramaśivendra and his disciple, Sadāśiva Brahmendra, in extremely high regard. On the other hand, the date claimed by the Kāñcī *maṭha* for Paramaśivendra is quite impossible, while Tirumala's text has remained unnoticed even by Kāñcī *maṭha paṇḍitas*. Antarkar's contention that it is a source for the *Mādhavīya* depends crucially upon his faulty dating; the error of a century creates serious problems for his argument that this *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* is an old text and a source for the *Mādhavīya*.

Antarkar does not investigate the sole manuscript of this work and its history, and he does not try to authenticate his transcript. He says that the transcript was full of mistakes and gaps that he has had to correct as much as possible. Did an inferior scribe put together the bad transcript or even the original manuscript using select verses from the *Mādhavīya*? This question is as valid as the accusa-

tions that have been made the other way round and would indeed be considered seriously by anyone interested in making a fair comparison of the two works. Antarkar always uncritically accepts a specific set of sources, while a bad transcript would have created its own biases. His footnotes claim to give 'better readings' than the transcript wherever possible. Having already decided that this work is prior to the *Mādhavīya*, has he emended Tirumala's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* by referring to corresponding verses in the *Mādhavīya*? In this context, note Antarkar's (1972: 13) claim that only Mādhava relates a story in which Śaṅkara reinterprets Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsā Sūtras* to Maṇḍana Miśra at the end of their famous debate, whereas Tirumala does not. Interestingly enough, chapter 5 of his own edition of Tirumala's work begins with precisely such a story, using identical verses. Either his comparison of these two texts is faulty, or his edition of Tirumala's text has itself borrowed this story from the *Mādhavīya*. Given that the *Mādhavīya* was well known for at least two centuries before Antarkar published Tirumala's work, the opposite conclusion, that is, that the *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* attributed to Tirumala Dīkṣita has effectively borrowed from the *Mādhavīya*, remains a serious possibility to be investigated.

The **Śaṅkarābhyudaya** *of Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita*

Unlike Vyāsācala and Tirumala Dīkṣita, who are not known for any other poetic works, Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita is a well-known poet from the seventeenth century. His *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* has been published by S. V. Radhakrishna Sastri (1986: iv), who says that the Adyar Library's manuscript of this poem contains six chapters with a commentary. The published text has eight chapters, with the seventh and eighth chapters taken from a Kāñcī *maṭha* manuscript. Antarkar (1972: 5–8) enumerates one hundred and twenty-five verses in common between this work and the *Mādhavīya*. Aiyar and Venkataraman (1977: 46) point out one hundred forty-nine verses in common, while Radhakrishna Sastri (1986: iv) says that there are one hundred sixty-seven such verses. The seventh chapter of this text describes a Sarvajñapīṭha at Kāñcīpuram, and the last verse of the eighth chapter says that Śaṅkara experienced *brahmānanda* (supreme bliss) by worshipping the goddess Kāmeśvarī at Kāñcīpuram. Radhakrishna Sastri (1986: 110) and Rama Sastri (1976: 61) interpret this to mean that Śaṅkara spent his last days in Kāñcīpuram, where he established a *maṭha*.[82] This reads too much into this verse. An experience of *brahmānanda* does not imply physical death, especially for Advaita Vedānta, which lays great emphasis on *jīvanmukti* (living liberation). The text contains no references to *mathas* and also does not explicitly describe Śaṅkara's last days.

The most outstanding feature of this text is its structure. The first four

chapters give most of the commonly known legends of Śaṅkara's life, with events arranged according to major themes. That they are not necessarily in chronological order is seen by the frequent use of the word *kadācana* (at some time). The first chapter describes the poet, his family, his *guru*, Gīrvāṇendra Sarasvatī, and the events from Śaṅkara's birth to his initiation into *saṃnyāsa* and composition of various works. The second chapter describes all the important people in Śaṅkara's life, including Vyāsa, Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, and the disciples Padmapāda and Sureśvara, and their compositions. In the third chapter, the important themes are fire and Śaṅkara's memory. When his mother passes away, Śaṅkara overrules the objections of his relatives and produces fire for the cremation through the power of a *mantra*. Padmapāda reports that his manuscript of the *Pañcapādikā* was burnt in a fire orchestrated by an uncle. Śaṅkara relies on his memory to restore the portion that he had read earlier. He similarly restores the plays of the king, Rājaśekhara, which had been lost in another fire. Śaṅkara visits the village of Śivavaḷḷī, where the air is filled with smoke from the sacrificial fires of Brāhmaṇas. Here Hastāmalaka becomes his disciple. When Śaṅkara suffers from a disease caused by excess body heat, the devoted disciple, Toṭaka, takes care of him. The fourth chapter has brief descriptions of Śaṅkara's travels through the Kerala and Karnataka regions. It also includes many other common legends, such as the miraculous resurrection of a dead boy, Śaṅkara's encounter with a Kāpālika whose plan to use him as a sacrificial victim is thwarted by Padmapāda, and Śaṅkara's animating the dead body of a king with his yogic powers. It is noteworthy that all the verses common to the *Mādhavīya* and this *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* are found in the approximately two hundred and fifty verses of the first four chapters.

The last four chapters give detailed descriptions of Śaṅkara's pilgrimage tours in the Tamil region and his composition of hymns to various deities. Of the forty-nine verses in the fifth chapter, twenty-four constitute a hymn to Padmanābha at Anantaśayana (Trivandrum?) and twenty verses are in praise of Mīnākṣī-Sundareśvara at Madurai. The sixth chapter describes Rāmeśvaram, with forty-two out of forty-five verses devoted to the legend of Rāma. The seventh chapter describes temples on the banks of the Kāverī and contains hymns to Śrīraṅgam, Mannārguḍi, Cidambaram, Aruṇācala, and Kāñcīpuram. Along the way, the *ācārya* visits the poet's ancestral home on the banks of the river Pinākinī and travels through the poet's father's village. Finally, he ascends a Sarvajñapīṭha at Kāñcīpuram and composes verses based on the fifteen-syllable Śrīvidyā-*mantra* and a related six-syllable *mantra*.[83] The eighth chapter concentrates entirely on the description of the *śrīcakra* and has hymns in praise of its associated deities. However, most of these verses are incomplete and also seem to have doubtful readings, according to Radhakrishna Sastri's footnotes.

This binary structure of the text, with a clear demarcation of content, is remarkable. The first four chapters rearrange various commonly known legends of Śaṅkara's life in a thematic manner, while the last four chapters introduce us to various hymns in the guise of Śaṅkara's pilgrimage tour. In the first chapter, Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita salutes Gīrvāṇendra Sarasvatī with the words Paryāya Śaṅkarācārya, that is, as equivalent to Śaṅkarācārya. Gīrvāṇendra is the author of a commentary on the *Prapañcasāra*, a *mantraśāstra* text traditionally attributed to Śaṅkara. Rājacūḍāmaṇi also mentions this in his salutation. The *Prapañcasāra* is again given a very prominent place in the poet's list of Śaṅkara's compositions.[84] The hymns in the last two chapters are predominantly associated with *mantraśāstra*. It is quite possible that these and the other hymns in the last four chapters are compositions of Gīrvāṇendra but attributed by the poet to Śaṅkara. When Rājacūḍāmaṇi tells us that the *ācārya* visited his ancestral home and his father's village, it is far more likely that this was some Śaṅkarācārya who lived closer to his own times rather than the original Śaṅkara. This leads me to believe that Rājacūḍāmaṇi's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* presents us with a composite figure of Śaṅkara, with the first four chapters condensing Śaṅkara's traditional hagiography and the last four chapters presenting pilgrimage tours and compositions of a later personality, most probably Gīrvāṇendra Sarasvatī.

The image of Śaṅkara preserved in this text also contrasts very significantly with that in the *Mādhavīya*. In the *Śaṅkarābhyudaya*, philosophical debates are described in a cursory manner, and the emphasis is on Śaṅkara as an adept in *mantraśāstra* and as a composer of hymns. *Mādhavīya* has its share of such hymns but mainly focuses on Śaṅkara's defense of Advaita against Bhedābheda Vedānta and Pūrva Mīmāṃsā. Taking into account the fact that debates with these two specific schools belong to an earlier period in the history of Advaita, *Mādhavīya* emerges as the comparatively older text. The first four chapters of the *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* seem indebted to an earlier, fully developed hagiography. There is nothing to suggest that this earlier text is not the *Mādhavīya*. This is diametrically opposed to Antarkar's conclusion about these texts.

Antarkar's (1972: 5–8) argument that more elaborate details of some legends indicate the late date of a text is neither conclusive nor made consistently. For example, Rājacūḍāmaṇi briefly mentions the composition of *Pañcapādikā* and *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* in his second chapter, whereas Mādhava gives a detailed account of these two texts in his thirteenth chapter. The 1954 *Vyāsācalīya* also gives the same kind of detail, with many verses identical to those in *Mādhavīya*. However, Antarkar still thinks that the *Vyāsācalīya* was composed in the fifteenth century, that is, two centuries before Rājacūḍāmaṇi wrote his *Śaṅkarābhyudaya*. If the 1954 *Vyāsācalīya* is older than this *Śaṅkarābhyudaya*, in spite of a relatively greater degree of elaboration, there is no valid reason to

think that a similar degree of elaboration in the *Mādhavīya* indicates a late date.

The **Patañjalicarita** *of Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita*

Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita is a well-known poet from the seventeenth century. Kāñcī *maṭha* texts cite his *Patañjalicarita* (1934) as a valuable authority on the lives of Gauḍapāda, Govinda, and Śaṅkara, but Mahadevan (1960: 12–13) takes the safe route and does not rely on it. Antarkar (1972: 5–8) finds eleven verses in common between the last chapter of this work and the *Mādhavīya*. Aiyar and Venkataraman (1977: 44–45) point out fifteen such verses and argue for borrowing in the opposite direction. The last chapter of this text seems to identify Govinda, Śaṅkara's *guru*, with one Candragupta. Aiyar and Venkataraman (1977: 37) comment that Candragupta does not sound like the name of a Brāhmaṇa. In response, Candraśekharendra Sarasvatī (1980: 11–13), Radhakrishna Sastri (1986: 111–16), and Rama Sastri (1976: 1-5) give the name not as Candragupta, but as Candraśarmā.[85] In any case, as the title *Patañjalicarita* suggests, Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita is concerned mainly with Patañjali and Bhartṛhari, the notable grammarians. Indeed, it is open to question whether the last chapter is really a part of Rāmabhadra's original *Patañjalicarita*. It does not naturally fit in with the preceding chapters in this poem, and it is quite unclear what Govinda and Śaṅkara have to do with Patañjali and Bhartṛhari. Śaṅkara is mentioned very briefly, in roughly seventy verses in the last chapter, with only eleven (or fifteen) verses in common with Mādhava's text. The possibility that this chapter does not originally belong to the *Patañjalicarita* cannot be ruled out, but it is also possible that Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita himself borrowed a small number of verses from Mādhava.

A reappraisal of the **Mādhavīya**

In summary, the argument that the *Mādhavīya* borrows from other texts simply ignores the fact that its supposed source texts present numerous insurmountable problems. The *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* of Tirumala Dīkṣita and the published text of the *Śaṅkaravijaya* of Vyāsācala account for roughly 90 percent of the verses that the *Mādhavīya* is said to have borrowed, and, significantly enough, these two texts give rise to the most severe doubts about their origins. It is also not clear that a greater elaboration of stories indicates a later date because a later author can choose either to build upon or to condense earlier accounts. Rājacūḍāmaṇi's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* may represent the latter case. A more basic issue to be clarified is the number of common verses found in the *Mādhavīya* as compared to the other texts. Completely different counts are given by Antarkar and by

sources from Śṛṅgeri and Kāñcī *maṭhas* with respect to the texts of Vyāsācala, Rājacūḍāmaṇi, and Rāmabhadra. Antarkar's list of common verses in Tirumala's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* is faulty, but no *paṇḍita* from either *maṭha* has noticed this text. The two *Bhagavatpādasaptati* texts claimed by Rama Sastri do not seem to have ever been published. While Kāñcī *maṭha paṇḍitas* make explicit claims, Antarkar (1972: 20–23) insinuates a systematic conspiracy behind the production and popularization of a plagiarized *Śaṅkaravijaya* on the part of Mādhava Bhaṭṭa and/or the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*. It is worth reiterating that complete manuscripts of the *Mādhavīya* are available from many places, as admitted by Antarkar himself, whereas those of the claimed source texts are relatively scarce. Thus, the claim is that Mādhava Bhaṭṭa and/or the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* prepared a *Mādhavīya* text by borrowing extensively from a number of other texts, successfully attributed it to Vidyāraṇya, arranged for it to be repeatedly copied and widely distributed, and effectively suppressed the circulation of its sources. This does not seem very likely. It would be equally or more probable that these other texts have borrowed from the *Mādhavīya*.

Tapasyānanda (1980: ix–xv) dismisses the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s arguments against the *Mādhavīya* as 'scurrilous criticism' and 'bazaar gossip.' He takes the stance that Mādhava is Vidyāraṇya and that it is a literary feature of Vidyāraṇya's undisputed works to quote other authors without specific attribution. This argument ultimately goes nowhere, as Vidyāraṇya's date is undoubtedly in the fourteenth century, while the two *Śaṅkarābhyudayas* and the *Patañjalicarita* come from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Even Vidyāraṇya could not have anonymously reproduced verses from texts written three or four centuries after him. Moreover, anonymous quotation is not just characteristic of Vidyāraṇya; most classical Sanskrit texts make quotations without specific attributions, having been written for a specific audience that is expected to be knowledgeable. If the *Mādhavīya* were indeed by Vidyāraṇya, the contention of Śṛṅgeri followers regarding the direction of borrowing would be vindicated. However, Tapasyānanda does not seem to have done a detailed investigation of the texts attributed to Vyāsācala and Tirumala. Thus, the problem of the common verses in these texts admits of no easy solutions. Antarkar's conclusions about the direction of borrowing are vitiated by his faulty evaluations of the other texts, a result of his undeniable bias toward one particular *maṭha*'s sources.

Tapasyānanda also offers a stronger defense, praising the value of *Mādhavīya* as a hagiography. He highlights the depth of philosophical acumen found in its description of Śaṅkara's debates and the author's deep familiarity with all Hindu philosophical doctrines. This is definitely the most important feature of the text. In his descriptions of Śaṅkara's debates with Maṇḍana and Bhāskara, Mādhava presents a fine defense of Śaṅkaran Advaita against other kinds of Vedānta and

Mīmāṃsā. Among the available hagiographies, this text gives the best account of the philosophical and religious background of early Advaita, which may account for its great popularity within the tradition. Mādhava even mentions Vācaspati Miśra as a future rebirth of Sureśvara, owing to *prārabdha karma* (*karma* that has already begun to fructify), so that Sureśvara's thwarted desire to comment on the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* gets fulfilled in a future life through the composition of the *Bhāmatī*. One should also note that in spite of Mādhava's anachronisms, independent evidence more or less confirms his description of Kumārila, Bhāskara, and Maṇḍana as Śaṅkara's contemporaries.

Seen in proper context, the *Mādhavīya* is neither partial to Śṛṅgeri or to the other *āmnāya maṭha*s nor biased against Kāñcī. All Śaṅkaravijaya texts that describe *maṭha*s mention Śṛṅgeri and connect it with the story of Śaṅkara's debate with Maṇḍana Miśra, alias Viśvarūpa.[86] The main legend is that Maṇḍana's wife, Bhāratī, was so learned that she was considered an incarnation of the goddess Sarasvatī. She was the referee at this debate, and after her husband lost to Śaṅkara, a temple was established in her name at Śṛṅgeri. Some version of this story is found in all the Śaṅkaravijaya texts, and the *Mādhavīya* (10.71) is no exception.[87] Chapter 12 of the *Mādhavīya* describes Śṛṅgeri in a total of six verses (12.64–69) and proceeds to narrate other traditions about Śaṅkara's disciples. If some staunch Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* follower had put together this text as late as the seventeenth or eighteenth century, one might expect him to have taken the opportunity to introduce at least some of the other legends specific to Śṛṅgeri into this chapter. On the contrary, after briefly mentioning Śṛṅgeri in chapter 12, *Mādhavīya* (14.168) implies that Śaṅkara had already left the place. Dvārakā and Badrināth are mentioned along Śaṅkara's travel route (*Mādhavīya* 15.73–75, 16.93–94), but Purī is not. Kāñcī is mentioned once in a description of Padmapāda's pilgrimage (*Mādhavīya* 14.59–61) and again with respect to Śaṅkara's reform of the Tantric worship at its Devī temple (15.4–5). Finally, Mādhava does not mention how many *maṭha*s were established by Śaṅkara. He provides only a general description,[88] implying *āśrama*s at Śṛṅgeri and other places.

It might be objected that this text is indeed partial to Śṛṅgeri, singling it out as the site of a Śaṅkaran institution. However, this needs to be compared with what is found in other texts. Cidvilāsa's *Śaṅkaravijaya Vilāsa* (Antarkar 1973) devotes three entire chapters to a description of Śṛṅgeri and the establishment of the *maṭha* and the Śāradā temple at that place. Cidvilāsa also devotes one chapter each to the *āmnāya maṭha*s at Dvārakā, Purī, and Badrināth. He describes the consecration of a *śrīcakra* at Kāñcīpuram, where he also places the Sarvajña-pīṭha, but he does not mention the establishment of a *maṭha* in that city.[89] Thus, when Cidvilāsa's text was written, the four *āmnāya maṭha* tradition

seems to have been undisputed but that of a Sarvajñapīṭha at Kāñcī must have been current. Interestingly, texts that place the Sarvajñapīṭha at Kāśmīra do not mention a *maṭha* there. One must therefore distinguish between a *maṭha* established by Śaṅkara and the tradition of a preexisting Sarvajñapīṭha. Even the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s *Suṣamā* and chapter 63 in all editions of Anantānandagiri's *Śaṅkaravijaya* explicitly mention that Śaṅkara and his disciples stayed at Śṛṅgeri for twelve years. This is a widespread oral tradition, but Mādhava does not mention it. Thus, no account of monastic institutions seems to find it possible to eliminate a reference to Śṛṅgeri. Whoever its author may be, the *Mādhavīya* is not more partial to Śṛṅgeri than these other texts. It is also not very likely that all the *kīrtanakāras* and preachers who have traditionally used this text are especially close to the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*, to the exclusion of all other religious institutions. The simple fact seems to be that of the numerous Śaṅkaravijaya texts with all their variant traditions, the *Mādhavīya* and its traditions have been most widely accepted. It is in this perspective that one must view the endorsement of the *Mādhavīya* by the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* and other Daśanāmī institutions, while only the Kāñcī *maṭha* rejects this text.

The author of the *Mādhavīya* explicitly informs us, in his very first verse, that he has relied upon a *Prācīna Śaṅkarajaya*. However, many other texts have come to be identified as his sources, without investigating whether these other texts are themselves indebted to this putatively older text. It should also be investigated whether the texts claimed as sources of the *Mādhavīya* have borrowed from one another. An Ur-*Śaṅkaravijaya* may have been only an oral account, growing variously in time and branching into different versions. In particular, the two texts attributed to Mādhava and Vyāsācala may represent different written redactions of this text, as they share the greatest amount of material, while Rājacūḍāmaṇi's text may be a condensation of such an older account. My discussion of these texts has been largely exploratory, so that an independent, impartial, rigorous, and comparative textual analysis still remains to be done.

TEXTUAL TRADITIONS AND MODERN RESEARCH

All hagiographic texts locate Śaṅkara's birth in Kerala, except for the earlier editions of Anantānandagiri's text that mention Cidambaram. A few texts say nothing at all about the establishment of *maṭhas*. Mādhava provides only a generic statement about monastic institutions, but Cidvilāsa explicitly mentions all four *āmnāya maṭhas*. Both Cidvilāsa and Mādhava place Śaṅkara's last

days in the Himālayas, agreeing with other Daśanāmī traditions (Giri 1976; Sarkar 1946). The earlier editions of Anantānandagiri mention a *maṭha* only at Śṛṅgeri, but the 1971 Madras edition mentions a *maṭha near* Śṛṅgeri and another at Kāñcīpuram. All editions of Anantānandagiri's text are silent about the Sarvajñapīṭha, which is in Kāśmīra according to the *Mādhavīya* and the 1954 *Vyāsācalīya* but in Kāñcī according to the texts of Cidvilāsa and Rājacūḍāmaṇi. In this context, Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita's reference to the *Prapañcasāra* and his salutation of Gīrvāṇendra Sarasvatī, his *guru*, as a Paryāya Śaṅkarācārya are notable. That the first verse of *Prapañcasāra* salutes the goddess Śāradā is usually explained by the tradition that Śāradā is the presiding goddess in Kāśmīra, where Śaṅkara ascended the Sarvajñapīṭha (Pande 1994).[90] Therefore, the older Kāśmīra Sarvajñapīṭha tradition is perhaps to be traced to the author of *Prapañcasāra*. However, while Gīrvāṇendra, the teacher, wrote a commentary on *Prapañcasāra*, Rājacūḍāmaṇi, the disciple, is totally silent about Kāśmīra. This fits in with my hypothesis that the last four chapters of the *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* refer to Gīrvāṇendra Sarasvatī or some other *guru* in his immediate lineage. One of these later *gurus* must have given rise to a Kāñcī Sarvajñapīṭha tradition, which is recounted by Rājacūḍāmaṇi. Under this reconstruction, Cidvilāsa, who places the Sarvajñapīṭha at Kāñcī, may have lived in the seventeenth century or later.

The two Sarvajñapīṭha traditions are conflated in Govindanātha's *Keraḷīya Śaṅkaravijaya*, usually dated to the seventeenth century (Antarkar 1992a). This text seems to identify Kāñcīpuram with Kāśmīra and the goddess Kāmākṣī, usually considered to be a form of Pārvatī, with Vāgdevī and Bhāratī, which are names of Sarasvatī. An identification of Kāñcī (a *pura*) with Kāśmīra (a *deśa*) can be easily disregarded, but it should be noted that the goddess Śāradā of the Kāśmīra Sarvajñapīṭha is also a form of Sarasvatī. The Kāśmīra Sarvajñapīṭha tradition may have been already well known, but the Kāñcī Sarvajñapīṭha tradition must have been gaining strength; this author acknowledges both in his own way.[91] Interestingly, Govindanātha holds that Śaṅkara finally returned to Trichūr in Kerala and passed away there. Evidently he wants to complete the circle, so that Śaṅkara's last days are spent at the same place where his parents first prayed for his birth. It seems clear that placing the Sarvajñapīṭha in the south significantly enhances his narrative of Śaṅkara's return to Trichūr towards the end of his life.

Rama Sastri (1976: 58–59) builds imaginatively upon Govindanātha's account of the Sarvajñapīṭha and holds that Kāñcīpuram is known as 'South-Kāśmīra,' a name that is unheard of in any other source. However, he dismisses the story of Śaṅkara's last days in Trichūr as arising out of too much 'local patriotism' on Govindanātha's part. This may be so, but he relies on this text

quite selectively; his criticism of Govindanātha can also be applied to Rama Sastri himself, as his brand of 'local patriotism' extends only to Kāñcīpuram. Thus, he relies on the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s *Suṣamā* and claims that Govindanātha's *Śaṅkarācāryacarita* has six additional verses. These say that after ascending the Sarvajñapīṭha, Śaṅkara established a *maṭha* at Kāñcī, appointed Sureśvara as its head, installed a *yogaliṅga*, and spent his last days there. However, these six verses are not found in any manuscript of Govindanātha's text (Antarkar 1992a: 58) and contradict its account of Śaṅkara's last days in Trichūr. The *Śaṅkarācāryacarita* is also silent about the establishment of *maṭhas*. Clearly, different traditions about the same place do not necessarily go together in the textual sources (Table 1), while other traditions have little textual support. Śaṅkara is also claimed to have established the Karavīrapīṭha near Kolhāpur in Maharashtra and to have passed away there (Rama 1989: 197, 478). Yet another tradition places his last days at a Dattātreyapīṭha in Māhūr in Maharashtra (Tapasyānanda 1980: xxxiii). Thus, a number of places claim the honor of being Śaṅkara's final destination, but only the Himālayas and Kāñcīpuram are well known in this context nowadays. Unlike Kāñcīpuram, there are no currently influential *maṭhas* pressing for the claims of Trichūr, Kolhāpur, and Māhūr.

The great visibility of a few specific traditions among a number of different variants creates many problems for modern academic studies of Advaita Vedānta and its teachers. Mahadevan and Veezhinathan are self-professed followers of the Kāñcī *maṭha*. Their 1971 edition of Anantānandagiri's text is basically a Kāñcī *maṭha* publication, but Mahadevan seems to have retained some independence in his earlier works. In a historical account of Śaṅkara and his disciples, Potter (1981: 17) associates Sureśvara especially with Kāñcīpuram, the only sources for which are the 1971 *Anantānandagirīya* edition and other Kāñcī publications. In a separate introduction to an account of Sureśvara's works, Potter (1981: 420) mentions that Sureśvara was given control over all the *maṭhas*.[92] All sources for this claim can be traced to the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s *Suṣamā*, according to which Sureśvara was not a *paramahaṃsa saṃnyāsin* (highest order of monks); he was not qualified for becoming the head of any *maṭha* and was therefore asked to supervise all of them. While the claim that Sureśvara was not a *paramahaṃsa saṃnyāsin* is certainly unique, it is mystifying how this supposed non-*paramahaṃsa* status disqualified him for direct charge of any *maṭha* while simultaneously giving him effective control over all of them. *Suṣamā* also insists that Śaṅkara appointed one Pṛthvīdhara at Śṛṅgeri and Sarvajñātman at Kāñcī, both under the tutelage of Sureśvara. Sarvajñātman is claimed to have become Śaṅkara's direct disciple, but after Śaṅkara passed away, Sureśvara was supposedly in charge of Sarvajñātman's education. However, Sureśvara is said to have left Sarvajñātman at Kāñcī and gone to Śṛṅgeri (Aiyer and Sastri 1962).[93]

Table 1. Major Textual Traditions

Source	Birth-place	Last Days	*Sarvajñapīṭha*	*Maṭhas*
Daśanāmī traditions (Giri 1976; Sarkar 1946)	Kālaṭi	Himālayas	Kāśmīra	Śṛṅgeri, Dvārakā, Purī, Badrināth
Mādhava	Kālaṭi	Himālayas	Kāśmīra	Śṛṅgeri and other places
Cidvilāsa	Kālaṭi	Himālayas	Kāñcīpuram	Śṛṅgeri, Dvārakā, Purī, Badrināth
Govindanātha	Kālaṭi	Trichūr	Kāñcīpuram and/or Kāśmīra	—
Rājacūḍāmaṇi	Kālaṭi	?	Kāñcīpuram	—
Anantānandagiri (1868, 1881, 1982)	Cidambaram	?	—	Śṛṅgeri
Anantānandagiri (Veezhinathan 1971)	Kālaṭi	Kāñcīpuram	—	*near* Śṛṅgeri, Kāñcīpuram
Guruvaṃśakāvya (Śṛṅgeri text)	Kālaṭi	Dattātreya cave (location?)	Kāśmīra	Śṛṅgeri, Dvārakā, Purī, Badrināth
Gururatnamālā, *Suṣamā* (Kāñcī texts)	Kālaṭi	Kāñcīpuram	Kāñcīpuram	Śṛṅgeri, Dvārakā, Purī, Badrināth, Kāñcīpuram

Notes:
1. A dash in a column indicates that the text says nothing about the corresponding category.
2. A question mark leaves open a possibility that the corresponding text may be incomplete.

This leaves unexplained both Pṛthvīdhara's role at Śṛṅgeri and Sureśvara's role at the other three *maṭha*s while effectively conceding the Śṛṅgeri tradition about Sureśvara. Although Veezhinathan gives all these stories in his 1972 edition of Sarvajñātman's *Saṃkṣepa Śārīraka*, his 1971 *Anantānandagirīya* edition says nothing about Pṛthvīdhara or Sarvajñātman and claims Sureśvara solely for the Kāñcī *maṭha*, assigning Padmapāda to Śṛṅgeri.

Cenkner (1983) talks of the five Vidyāpīṭhas at Śṛṅgeri, Dvārakā, Purī, Badrināth, and Kāñcī, but he discusses Śṛṅgeri and Kāñcī more than the other three.[94] When he notes that a reconstruction of a critical and definitive history embracing all five centers is quite improbable, Cenkner does not seem to realize that this is precisely because of the nature of the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s claims. One can have either what he calls the 'more inclusive' tradition of the Kāñcī *maṭha* or a definitive and critical historical reconstruction, but not both. Clearly, the Kāñcī *maṭha* has been, and is currently, in direct competition with the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* for being considered the most important center of the Śaṅkaran tradition in southern India. In the process, a number of claims and counterclaims have been made that have also changed with time.[95] Śṛṅgeri has the benefit of a recorded history that is more than six centuries old and the support of old Daśanāmī tradition, while all available evidence indicates that Kāñcī is a comparatively recent institution. Cenkner seems to be highly influenced by the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s contemporary image, to the point that a major portion of his work reads like an apologetic on its behalf. Although he is aware of the controversy that has surrounded the Kāñcī *maṭha* throughout its known history, he accepts most of its claims. This comes at the expense of accuracy in reporting, even with respect to events in recent history. For example, he says that the succession in Purī, Dvārakā, and Śṛṅgeri have all been challenged recently (Cenkner 1983: 110). He is right about Purī and Dvārakā, but not about Śṛṅgeri. His source for this statement is a Kāñcī *maṭha* publication (Aiyer and Sastri 1962: 188) that talks about a succession dispute not at Śṛṅgeri but at the Kūḍalī *maṭha*. Surely, Cenkner has to be aware of the Kāñcī claim that Kūḍalī is the parent of Śṛṅgeri, as this has been repeated many times by his sources. He seems to be thoroughly confused by the complicated nature of the inter-*maṭha* rivalries, but much of his confusion originates from his uncritical acceptance of all the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s claims about itself and about others. Another problem is that Cenkner does not seem to pay the same attention to the other *maṭha*s as compared to Kāñcīpuram. Thus, he is strangely silent about the ongoing succession controversy at Badrināth and conveys the impression that this seat is undisputed. The political connections of all the rival contenders, and the relationship of one faction with Maharṣi Maheśa Yogī (Transcendental Meditation), have been widely known for over four decades now.

Pande (1994) discusses the Śaṅkaravijaya texts, *maṭha* traditions, and related literature in some detail. He mentions that only the Śṛṅgeri records and one other text are consistent with internal evidence from Śaṅkara's undisputed works. Pande also differs from Antarkar's analysis of the *Mādhavīya* and other texts and allows the possibility that the borrowing may be in the opposite direction. However, although he says that *maṭha* traditions need to be viewed critically, his analysis is not very critical at all. He tries to accept all the historical claims of the *maṭha*s that are currently well known. Thus, he talks of five *āmnāya maṭha*s, whereas the Daśanāmī sources are quite specific about the number four. Moreover, he ignores the Kolhāpur Karavīrapīṭha and the Vāraṇāsi Sumerupīṭha, which have also been candidates for 'fifth *maṭha*' status. He describes Indra-Sarasvatī as an eleventh-name suffix, although the very word Daśanāmī refers to the ten (*daśa*) accepted names (*nāma*), Sarasvatī being one of these ten. Like Antarkar, Pande also accepts the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s claim to Ānandagiri, the *ṭīkākāra*, and his *guru*, Śuddhānanda, in its lineage. Neither of these scholars seeks to compare the Kāñcī list with independent, external sources, and both seem to be unaware of the Dvārakā *maṭha*'s claim to Śuddhānanda and Ānandagiri. Pande claims to have studied the traditions of all the *maṭha*s, but surely the Dvārakā tradition deserves an equal consideration, if not more, compared to that of Kāñcī. He also accepts an early twelfth-century date given by a Kāñcī *maṭha* follower for a copper-plate inscription from Tamilnadu and holds that this is the earliest available independent evidence for any Śaṅkarite institution. This date for the inscription is highly problematic, as neutral scholars with no stakes in the *maṭha* controversies have given dates in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. There is no indication that the *maṭha* mentioned in it belonged to the Advaita tradition. Moreover, the language of the inscription leads to legitimate questions about the identities of the donor and donee of the gift that it records.[96] Pande seems overly anxious to project a unified face for all the currently famous *maṭha*s, but this comes at the cost of neglecting other traditions such as those of the Dvārakā *maṭha*. In postulating a close connection between Śṛṅgeri and Kāñcī in Śaṅkara's times, Pande is indulging in unnecessary speculation. There has indeed been some connection between the two centers, especially over the last two centuries, but this cannot be traced to Śaṅkara's own times.

RELATING HAGIOGRAPHY TO HISTORY

Studies on Śaṅkara's hagiography have hitherto concentrated mainly on the

mythic paradigms employed in these texts and have not tried to relate the texts to the post-Śaṅkaran Advaita tradition. Lorenzen (1983) sees the Śaṅkaravijaya texts, especially the *Mādhavīya*, as belonging to a late genre in which Śaṅkara is apotheosized into an incarnation of Śiva, following a Vaiṣṇava conception of *avatāra*. However, it should be noted that even Sureśvara and Padmapāda compare Śaṅkara to Śiva in their salutation verses in *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* and *Pañcapādikā*. An *avatāra* conception is not explicit here, but the notion that Śaṅkara was an incarnation of Śiva may have crystallized over a period of time and later been amplified into a full-fledged account in the hagiographic texts. William Sax (2000) notes the late dates of the important hagiographic texts and postulates that Śaṅkara's hagiographies perhaps emulate the historical accounts of the pilgrimage journeys of late Vaiṣṇava leaders, such as Madhva, Vallabha, and Caitanya. On the other hand, by the time these texts were composed, 'Śaṅkarācārya' had already become a title for significant Advaita *guru*s and for heads of Advaita monastic institutions. It was no longer the name of a single historical person. It should also be noted that the more scholastic focus on Śaṅkara as a composer of *bhāṣya*s is limited to the core of the monastic tradition. In the popular perception, Śaṅkara's fame has more to do with his reputation as a religious leader who harmonized the major Hindu traditions, visited various temples, and composed hymns. Indeed, Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* and Govindanātha's *Keraḷīya Śaṅkaravijaya* present to us only this 'popular' Śaṅkara. Many of these tours and hymns are probably attributable to the later titular Śaṅkarācāryas. With an increase in the number of *maṭha*s, the number of Śaṅkarācāryas and the legends associated with this title would have correspondingly increased. Thus, it is very likely that each text invests Śaṅkara with a different composite personality, with each later author drawing upon legends associated with those whom he himself regarded as titular Śaṅkarācāryas. This would account for the many variant textual accounts of Śaṅkara's life. Anantānandagiri's Śaṅkara was probably someone who was born at Cidambaram, and Govindanātha's Śaṅkarācārya must have been someone who passed away at Trichūr. The Kāñcī Sarvajñapīṭha may be associated with Gīrvāṇendra Sarasvatī, whom Rājacūḍāmaṇi explicitly salutes as a Śaṅkarācārya. However, Gīrvāṇendra's own *maṭha* must have been elsewhere, as he is not listed in the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s lineage. By the same reasoning, one may perhaps relate the Kāśmīra Sarvajñapīṭha in Mādhava's text to Vidyā Tīrtha (Vidyā-śaṅkara) of Śṛṅgeri, whom Mādhava salutes at the beginning of his text. In both cases, the geographical locus of a Sarvajñapīṭha needs to be distinguished from that of a *maṭha*.

There are other interesting aspects of these texts that remain to be explored. Bruce Lincoln (1989) points out that historical facts are discernible within

the generic ahistorical patterns of myth and that one can deduce an author's conception of his hagiographic text as a record of history and as a political tool. Unlike other Hindu traditions that have strong associations with specific regions and communities, the Śaṅkaran tradition is widespread all over India. This considerably complicates a comparative study of the Śaṅkaravijayas. Therefore, I propose to place these texts in their historical and political context based on what we know about the authors to whom they are traditionally attributed. All the currently extant Śaṅkaravijaya texts date from relatively late times and most are of southern origin. This contrasts significantly with the fact that subcommentaries were written on Śaṅkara's works from very early times by authors from all over the country. The earliest date that can be given to the *Mādhavīya*, based on its traditional attribution, is the fourteenth century, while the *Anantānandagirīya* is an even later text. It is questionable if the text attributed to a so-called Citsukha ever existed. The lost *Śaṅkaravijaya* of Ānandagiri, the *ṭīkākāra*, if it ever existed, would not have been older than the thirteenth century. Thus, it seems that a detailed written hagiography of Śaṅkara is a late development within the Advaita monastic tradition. In an early post-Śaṅkaran period, Advaitins may have handed down a few oral traditions that would have eventually found their way into the written hagiographies. Therefore, the common elements preserved in oral Daśanāmī accounts, *maṭha* traditions, and written texts most likely represent the oldest traditions about Śaṅkara. Divergent accounts can probably be related to various local developments spread over several centuries.

The earliest possible dates of the *Mādhavīya* and the *Anantānandagirīya* take us squarely to early Vijayanagara times. A brief discussion of Vijayanagara history would, therefore, place the issues raised by these texts and the contemporary *maṭha*s in a critical perspective. Early Vijayanagara inscriptions tell us about the Advaita *maṭha* at Śṛṅgeri and its fourteenth-century *maṭhādhipati*s (heads of monasteries), Bhāratī Tīrtha and Vidyāraṇya, who were also important authors in the post-Śaṅkaran Advaita tradition. Along with Vidyāśaṅkara, their *guru*, they were greatly revered by the first dynasty of Vijayanagara, and royal honors were extended to them and the succeeding *maṭhādhipatis* at Śṛṅgeri. Such ritual honors continued to be shown by most Indian princes to the Śaṅkarācāryas of Śṛṅgeri, right up to India's independence (K. Venkataraman 1959: 4). Thus, all the currently available hagiographic texts were written in a period when the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* was already a famous institution. This explains numerous salient features of the *maṭha* disputes, such as why Śṛṅgeri is mentioned in every textual description of *maṭha*s, why the other three *āmnāya maṭha*s endorse Śṛṅgeri in spite of other internal differences, and why the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s conflicting claims are all necessarily directed against Śṛṅgeri.[97] Perhaps

the more intriguing feature of the hagiographic literature is that at least two seventeenth-century southern authors, Govindanātha and Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita, do not mention any *maṭhas*. This may represent an incipient southern schism, perhaps due to the decline of Vijayanagara in the late sixteenth century or due to the birth of a Kāñcī Sarvajñapīṭha tradition in the south. Cidvilāsa mentions all four *āmnāya maṭhas*, together with the Kāñcī Sarvajñapīṭha tradition, but Govindanātha conflates the latter with the older Kāśmīra Sarvajñapīṭha tradition. These texts are probably results of attempts to bridge older traditions with a newly divergent, and possibly schismatic, tradition in the south.

This reconstruction of history is quite tentative, but it brings us back to Paul Hacker's suggestion that it was Vidyāraṇya, not Śaṅkara, who established the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*. Hacker thinks that the tradition of four *āmnāya maṭhas* was an intentional act of cultural policy ('*einer Art bewüßter* Hindu-Kulturpolitik') to counteract Muslim influence in southern India.[98] This argument is based upon the important role played by Vidyāraṇya in the early Vijayanagara kingdom and an unquestioned attribution of the *Mādhavīya* to Vidyāraṇya. If one were to doubt this authorship, one must also raise doubts about Vidyāraṇya's responsibility for such a tradition. Even so, as this *Śaṅkaravijaya* does not mention the number four, Hacker's argument has very little textual evidence for it. As for other Vijayanagara records, Hermann Kulke (1985: 133–36), following Hacker's lead, points out that the earliest inscription that explicitly mentions a *maṭha* at Śṛṅgeri dates from 1356. He describes another authentic inscription that mentions a *vijayotsava* (festival celebrating victory) held at Śṛṅgeri in 1346 and acknowledges that Vidyāraṇya's predecessors, Vidyāśaṅkara and Bhāratī Tīrtha, were already at the place then. Because of the sparse reference to Śaṅkara in these early inscriptions, he concludes that the Śṛṅgeri tradition of the fourteenth century had really nothing to do with Śaṅkara himself. Kulke modifies Hacker's comments slightly to credit Vidyāśaṅkara, rather than Vidyāraṇya, with the establishment of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* and the four *āmnāya maṭha* tradition. He proposes that the 'Śṛṅgeri "Śaṅkara tradition" provided a further legitimation to Vijayanagara's claim to be the center of the new orthodoxy' (Kulke 1985: 141).

There are several important considerations that are overlooked by the proposal that the *āmnāya maṭha* tradition was born only in the fourteenth century. For example, Vidyāraṇya is credited with having established the Virūpākṣa *maṭha* at Hampi that continues with its own independent lineage. The proposals of Hacker and Kulke would make both Śṛṅgeri and Virūpākṣa *maṭhas* roughly equal in age. A *maṭha* at the capital would have been even more useful to the new royalty than the one at Śṛṅgeri. It is only oral tradition that takes the history of Śṛṅgeri back to Śaṅkara's own times, but the fact that early Vijayanagara inscriptions regard Śṛṅgeri as the primary center of the tradition indicates

that this *maṭha* had probably been functioning from earlier times. Second, a seal of Vidyāśaṅkara, dated to 1235 CE, has been found near Śṛṅgeri. Antonio Rigopoulos (1998: 236–37) reports that this inscription salutes Gauḍapāda, Govinda, and Dattātreya and carries the impression of a boar.[99] Thus, more than a century before Vijayanagara was born, Vidyāśaṅkara must have already been a person of sufficiently advanced age and leadership status in order to have required a seal in his name. This calls for careful reevaluation of the Vijayanagara inscriptions about Vidyāśaṅkara, Vidyāraṇya, and the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*. Third, a vast amount of literary evidence is available to us from the works of Bhāratī Tīrtha and Vidyāraṇya, namely, *Adhikaraṇa Ratnamālā*, *Vivaraṇaprameya Saṅgraha*, *Jīvanmukti Viveka*, *Pañcadaśī*, and subcommentaries on Śaṅkara's Upaniṣad *bhāṣyas*. These texts constitute sufficient evidence for accepting that these two authors and the institution they headed were indeed affiliated to Śaṅkaran Advaita Vedānta.

It should also be remembered that Ānanda Tīrtha (Madhvācārya) began as a Daśanāmī monk, in charge of a *maṭha* at Uḍupi, before breaking away to form the Dvaita Vedānta tradition. His hagiographers mention debates with 'Śaṅkara' at Śṛṅgeri (Aiyangar nd: 233–36). This is perhaps only a reference to Vidyāśaṅkara. The *ekadaṇḍī saṃnyāsins* of the Dvaita tradition continue to use Daśanāmī suffixes, particularly Tīrtha, but they are not nowadays counted as Daśanāmīs. As a matter of fact, the origin and growth of Dvaita Vedānta represents a major schism within the Daśanāmī monastic tradition as it existed in the thirteenth century. Thus, conflicts internal to the monastic tradition must have already created a need for Daśanāmī-Kulturpolitik, much before the need for Hindu-Kulturpolitik, in Vijayanagara times. The affiliation of the Advaitin monks to four representative *maṭhas* in the four regions of the country may have been a response that aimed to consolidate the *saṃnyāsa* tradition of Advaita. The lack of early Vijayanagara inscriptions with Śaṅkara's name may, indeed, point to the opposite conclusion, that is, that the *maṭha* tradition predates the birth of the Vijayanagara kingdom. After all, any new *maṭha* merely pretending to have been established by Śaṅkara would have itself needed some legitimization. If a new *maṭha* tradition was established purely to legitimate the new royalty, there would have been significant motivation, and more than ample opportunity, to get precisely such records prepared as to create the requisite pretense of antiquity. The absence of such records may indicate merely that a preexisting Advaita institution at Śṛṅgeri lent its support to the new rulers and did not have to invoke Śaṅkara's name in its Vijayanagara-era records.

Finally, one need not assume that a *maṭha* was anything more than a school associated with significant Advaita teachers, especially in early times. Tradition remembers four principal disciples of Śaṅkara, although only two of them,

Sureśvara and Padmapāda, have significantly influenced philosophical developments in post-Śaṅkaran Vedānta. Even if Śaṅkara did not deliberately set out to establish *maṭhas*, it is likely that such institutions developed in the places associated with these four disciples and their disciples in turn, thus coming to be known as the principal centers of the Śaṅkaran tradition. If Śaṅkara's works attracted a long line of subcommentaries between the ninth and fourteenth centuries, this could not have been possible without traditional schools where Śaṅkara's commentaries were studied. Indeed, Śaṅkara himself must have inherited an ancient tradition of Brāhmaṇical *saṃnyāsa*, the scholastic output of which was primarily concerned with Upaniṣadic exegesis. This tradition was perhaps earlier affiliated with the school of Bhedābheda Vedānta, later eclipsed by the rise of Advaita Vedānta. In post-Śaṅkaran times, the same monastic tradition gave birth to the school of Dvaita Vedānta. This tradition of monasticism needs to be correlated with the central importance given to renunciation in Śaṅkara's thought. The relative absence of evidence for *maṭhas* in pre-Vijayanagara times, in the form of inscriptions or other records, may be due to a number of valid reasons and need not be construed as evidence for the total absence of *maṭhas* in earlier times.

Maṭhas may have come into being gradually, or the earliest ones may have been established as late as the fourteenth century, or the *āmnāya maṭha* tradition may be an even later development within the tradition. Whatever role one may assign to different historical personalities in the development of the *āmnāya maṭhas*, the evidence points overwhelmingly to the conclusion that the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*'s traditional and historical primacy is undeniable. This places the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s claims in a particularly problematic position and also has direct implications for any discussion of the Śaṅkaravijayas. The attribution of the *Mādhavīya* to Vidyāraṇya may be doubted, but neither the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s arguments nor Antarkar's discussions of this text have proved that it dates from a very late period. Indeed, the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s claims about Śrīharṣa's *Naiṣadhīyacarita*, Anantānandagiri's *Śaṅkaravijaya*, the unavailable *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā*, and the verses not found in the *Vyāsācalīya*, *Keraḷīya*, and *Mādhavīya Śaṅkaravijayas* reveal a curiously deliberate pattern of textual manipulation. Ignoring the problems associated with these texts has seriously misled Antarkar in his analysis of the *Mādhavīya*. Thus, he essentially authenticates the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s claims that this is a recent text, written in order to favor the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*. However, notwithstanding the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*'s Dakṣiṇāmnāya status, the highly diffuse nature of the monastic leadership ensures that this *maṭha* could not have forced other independent institutions to accept unequivocally one of its late texts. When the documented history of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* is taken into account, it seems exceedingly naive to think that its followers waited until the

eighteenth or nineteenth century before producing their own original hagiographies.

The fact that many variant traditions are recorded in the Śaṅkaravijayas, without having resulted in much serious controversy in the past, shows that if the claims of a text are reasonable enough, or if they seek to alter the preexisting tradition only marginally, they generate little controversy. Tensions arise only when systematic manipulations of texts are made and propagated with great intensity. This is exemplified by the Kāñcī *maṭha* and its claims about the *Naiṣadhīyacarita*, *Vyāsācalīya*, *Keraḷīya*, and *Anantānandagirīya*. Veezhinathan has clearly designed his 1971 edition of the last text as a political tool to deliberately challenge the preexisting authority of Śṛṅgeri within the Advaita Vedānta tradition. The only mitigating factor is that he retains its statement that Śaṅkara stayed at Śṛṅgeri for twelve years. The Calcutta editions of this text place Sureśvara at Śṛṅgeri, not at Kāñcī, and do not acknowledge any of the other unique claims about the Indra-Sarasvatī name, the *yogaliṅga*, and the fifth *mahāvākya*. The last is a highly problematic issue, representing a clear departure from mainstream Daśanāmī tradition. If Anantānandagiri's text is to be seen as representative of the Kāñcī tradition (Lorenzen 1987: 64), this is largely the contribution of Mahadevan and Veezhinathan from Madras, building upon earlier efforts from Kumbhakoṇam and Kāñcīpuram. This should be viewed in the context of the relatively young age of the Kāñcī *maṭha*. An older institution either defines the tradition or it has otherwise already been well recognized within the tradition. Its conception of history and its political uses of hagiography belong to a more remote period in time. A newer institution probably feels a need for substantially rewriting this older hagiography, if it is to define its own unique place within the tradition. Part of this process involves rejection of some well-accepted texts (*Mādhavīya*), along with deliberate modifications of and interpolations into other texts (*Anantānandagirīya* and *Naiṣadhīyacarita*). A natural confusion arising from the similarity of the names Ānandagiri and Anantānandagiri is utilized effectively. Different strategies are adopted with respect to other obscure texts. Thus, specific verses are attributed to *Keraḷīya* and *Vyāsācalīya* that are not found in any of the available manuscripts. Extensive quotations are made from a *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā*, a *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya* attributed to Citsukha, a *Prācīna* text attributed to Mūkakavi, and a *Śaṅkarendra Vilāsa*, none of which is attested in any other source and the manuscripts of which have always been a little too conveniently 'missing.'

This discussion should show the reader that Śaṅkara's hagiographies are living texts, taking different forms and serving different uses at different times. It is important to note that the contemporary presence of a *maṭha* at a particular place is not correlated with other older traditions about that place. Nor does

a textual reference to some place lend legitimacy to all the claims of a *maṭha* that is currently based there. Not all traditions are reported in the same texts, so that the hagiographies and the traditions of individual *maṭhas* have to be studied against the larger background of recorded history and other available oral accounts. Each text can be discussed on its own merits, but none of these texts can be legitimately viewed completely in isolation from the others. Independent historical evidence should be given its due importance.

In conclusion, a personal note would perhaps be appropriate. Śaṅkara's hagiography is a fascinating topic that requires more serious analysis than it has hitherto received. In relating the hagiographic texts to the contemporary monastic institutions, I have had to severely criticize a few scholars for having treated their work as a tool for advancing the limited interests of one particular *maṭha*. I have also pointed out where an undue reliance on these few scholars has misled many others.[100] In turn, some readers may suspect that I am interested only in advancing the interests of a different *maṭha*. However, I have tried to be as evenly critical and impartial as possible in discussing the known history of these institutions. I trust that this paper will be read in this light and not be dismissed as yet another exercise in inter-*maṭha* politics. My study attempts to combine my own inherited native tradition with a critical scholarly perspective. It is for an impartial reader to judge how far I have succeeded in this endeavor.

Notes

1. This paper concentrates primarily on the Sanskrit hagiographic texts, taking into account secondary literature in various Indic languages, English, and German. All translations in this paper are mine. All Sanskrit quotations are rendered with split *sandhi*. I would like to thank Ashok Aklujkar, Patrick Olivelle, Dana Sawyer, and Frederick Smith for reading earlier drafts and sharing their valuable comments.

2. Mayeda (1992: 3–7) and Potter (1981: 3–18) review the internal evidence in Śaṅkara's works that leads to the early eighth-century date. Raja (1960) defends a later date in the eighth century. The 788 CE date is given in a chronogram found in a Deccan manuscript quoted by Pathak (1882). Nīlakaṇṭha from Kerala gives the same date in his *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* (Antarkar 1992b). It needs to be emphasized that 788–820 CE is also a sufficiently traditional date. The widespread contemporary impression is that the only 'traditional' date for Śaṅkara is the fifth century BCE (King 1999: 129).

3. Cinmayānanda (1978), Mayeda (1992), Potter (1981), Radhakrishnan

(1989), and Śivānanda (1993) rely on the *Mādhavīya* and accept its traditional attribution to Vidyāraṇya. Mayeda (1992: 7) gives a detailed list of editions of Mādhava's text.

4. The word *āmnāya* generally refers to received tradition, preeminently the Vedas, but the *āmnāya maṭhas* are usually named for the four directions. Thus, Purī is Pūrvāmnāya, Śṛṅgeri is Dakṣiṇāmnāya, Dvārakā is Paścimāmnāya, and Badrināth is Uttarāmnāya. In some texts, the Dvārakā *maṭha* is called Śāradāpīṭha instead of Kālikāpīṭha. I use the *āmnāya* terminology because counting in sets of four is a noteworthy feature of the tradition of Advaita Vedānta.

5. Usually, Araṇya and Vana orders are associated with the Purī *maṭha*; Bhāratī, Purī, and Sarasvatī with Śṛṅgeri; Āśrama and Tīrtha with Dvārakā; and Giri, Parvata, and Sāgara with Badrināth (Dazey 1987; *Encyclopedia Britannica* 1990, 3: 895, 10: 418–19; Ghurye 1953; Giri 1976; Radhakrishnan 1989, 2: 448; Sarkar 1946).

6. There is also an Agni *akhāḍā*, consisting of *brahmacārī* (student) novice members.

7. Bhāratī Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha, who was originally a student at Śṛṅgeri, became a monk at the Dvārakā *maṭha*, succeeded to this seat in 1921, and moved to the Purī *maṭha* in 1925. In 1945, he installed Abhinava Saccidānanda Tīrtha at Dvārakā, thereby putting an old succession dispute to rest. His own passing in 1960 created a succession problem at Purī, which was resolved when Nirañjanadeva Tīrtha was installed in 1964. Meanwhile, Badrināth *maṭha*, also known as the Jyotirmaṭha or Joṣīmaṭha, had been revived in 1941, after a hiatus of more than a century, with the support of the heads of the other three *āmnāya maṭhas*. The lineage of Brahmānanda, who was appointed as Śaṅkarācārya of Badrināth, is traced to Śṛṅgeri, probably based on the affiliation of the Sarasvatī orders with this *maṭha*. Brahmānanda Sarasvatī's demise in 1953 resulted in a new succession dispute that still awaits resolution (for details, see http://www.ucl.ac.uk/~ucgadkw/position/shank-jyot.html). A 1979 meeting of the heads of all four *maṭhas* is usually described as a historic first. There does not seem to be a history of sustained relations among these *maṭhas* before the twentieth century (Aiyar nd: 71–73). In 1982, after Abhinava Saccidānanda Tīrtha of Dvārakā passed away, Abhinava Vidyā Tīrtha of Śṛṅgeri installed Svarūpānanda Sarasvatī of Badrināth at Dvārakā. Svarūpānanda is officially the head of both these *āmnāya maṭhas* now, but the Badrināth title is under dispute.

8. The Rāmakṛṣṇa Maṭha monks implicitly trace their lineage to Śṛṅgeri, through Ṭoṭā Purī.

9. Rāma (1989: 197, 478) makes a similar claim for Karavīrapīṭha at Kolhāpur in Maharashtra: that Śaṅkara established that *maṭha* for himself and passed away nearby. In both cases, the suggestion is that the four *āmnāya maṭhas* were only

meant for Śaṅkara's four disciples, while the *maṭha* supposedly established by Śaṅkara for himself, during his last days, is a superior institution. The Karavīrapīṭha used to be reasonably famous in the early twentieth century but is no longer widely known today. The Sumerupīṭha at Vārāṇāsi currently suffers from a succession dispute (Sawyer 1993: 163). The Kāñcī *maṭha*'s succession has been relatively free of such internal disputes, which has contributed significantly to its contemporary success.

10. The Sarvajñapīṭha is usually identified with a Śāradāpīṭha in Kāśmīra. Al-Bīrūnī's (1971: 92) description of India mentions this site as a major center of Hindu scholarship. Rāmānuja, the teacher of Viśiṣṭādvaita, is also said to have traveled to this center in Kāśmīra (Rāmakṛṣṇānanda 1959: 189–91). As Rāmānuja was himself a native of Kāñcīpuram, the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s denial of the Kāśmīra Sarvajñapīṭha tradition stands out significantly.

11. Śṛṅgeri is near the source of the Tuṅgā River. Giri (1976: 17) lists Kūḍalī *maṭha*, situated at the confluence of the Tuṅgā and Bhadrā rivers, as subordinate to the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*.

12. This is based on *Suṣamā*, which claims *mūlāmnāya* status for Kāñcī (Pande 1994: 358).

13. See Aiyar and Venkataraman (1977); Anonymous (1965); interview with Niścalānanda Sarasvatī of Purī by Mohanty (1997); Sharma (1987); and public statements from Purī and Dvārakā *maṭha*s reported by Sunil (1987).

14. Standard manuals like K. Upadhyaya's *Dharmasindhu* (1986) list only the ten names and say nothing about a separate Indra-Sarasvatī suffix. In fairness to the Kāñcī *maṭha*, an argument subordinating it to Śṛṅgeri on the basis of the Sarasvatī suffix should be tempered by noting the largely nominal nature of this affiliation. However, the Kāñcī claim to unique usage of Indra-Sarasvatī is contradicted by the presence of numerous monks who use this variant name but have no connection to this *maṭha*, for example, Saccidānandendra Sarasvatī of Holenarsipur.

15. Aiyar and Venkataraman (1977: 214–18) quote a number of old texts that indicate that as of 1896, there had been four or five heads of the Kumbhakoṇam *maṭha* since its inception. Aiyar (nd: 71–73) holds that the Kumbhakoṇam *maṭha* is a schismatic branch of Śṛṅgeri. *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1990, 21: 158) mentions a *maṭha* only at Kumbhakoṇam, not at Kāñcīpuram. Mutaliyar's (1981: 1604) Tamil encyclopedia, an independent compilation of Tamil language materials, has an entry titled *Caṅkarāccāriyār maṭam*:

> *Āticaṅkarar...nāṉku maṭaṅkaḷ tāpittaṉar. Ivaikaḷuḷ ciraṉtatu Ciruṅkakiriyām. Ac Ciruṅkakiriyiṉ kiḷai maṭam Virūpākṣamām. Vittiyāraṇya cuvāmikaḷ kālattil Puṣpakiri maṭam uṇṭayiṟṟeṉpar. Piṉṉirintavarkaḷāl Kumpakoṇam,*

Amanī, Civakaṅkai, Kākarla maṭaṅkaḷ uṇṭāyiṉa.

> Ādi Śaṅkara...established four *maṭhas*. Of these, the chief is said to be at Śṛṅgeri. Virūpākṣa is a branch *maṭha* of Śṛṅgeri. It is said that Puṣpagiri *maṭha* came into being during the time of Vidyāraṇya *svāmin*. Kumbhakoṇam, Amanī, Śivagaṅgā, and Kākarla *maṭhas* were established by those who came later.

Śṛṅgeri sources emphasize this Kumbhakoṇam origin of the Kāñcī *maṭha*, which is downplayed in Kāñcī sources.

16. It must be noted that there was significant local opposition to the rights of the Kumbhakoṇam *maṭha* over the Kāñcī Kāmākṣī temple. Sharma (1987: 74–78) quotes petitions from the temple priests to British administrators in Madras, complaining that the British government had violated their ancient rights by handing over the temple to the Kumbhakoṇam Śaṅkarācārya, who was a stranger to Kāñcī. Mines and Gourishankar (1990: 775–76) note that the head of the *maṭha* gained full administrative control of the Kāmākṣī temple only in 1863. They also report two lawsuits brought by the priests of the Tañjāvūr Baṅgāru Kāmākṣī temple against the Kāñcī *maṭha* in the twentieth century. The Kāñcī *maṭha* claims absolute rights over both these temples but acknowledges that throughout the nineteenth century, the headquarters of the *maṭha* were based only in Kumbhakoṇam (Mahadevan 1983: 1–5). For a case study of British colonial involvement in temple administration in southern India, see Appadurai (1981). On the standard theme of describing a previous nonexistence as a 'temporary absence,' see Kulke's (1969) study of the Cidambaram Naṭarāja temple priests.

17. The *śrīcakra* consecrated at Kāñcīpuram is mentioned in the traditional *nāmāvalī* (list of names) on Śaṅkara (*kāñcyāṃ śrīcakrarājākhya yantrasthāpana dīkṣitaḥ* [the teacher who consecrated a *śrīcakra* at Kāñcī]). The *sthānīka* (temple manager/administrator) of the Kāñcīpuram Kāmākṣī temple (Kamakoti Sastri 1981: 14–15) also equates the Kāmakoṭipīṭha with a *śrīcakra*, not the *maṭha*. This distinction between a *maṭha* and a goddess *pīṭha* needs independent study.

18. It is generally assumed that the Kāñcī versus Śṛṅgeri rivalry is many centuries old (Sax 2000: 55). However, it cannot be older than the attested age of a *maṭha* at Kumbhakoṇam (note 15 above). The oldest documented dispute between these *maṭhas* dates to 1845 and relates to their claims over the *tāṭaṅka-pratiṣṭhā* ceremony (consecration of earrings) at the Akhilāṇḍeśvarī temple in Trichy.

19. Aiyer and Sastri (1962) give the text of the so-called Sudhanvan grant in modern Devanāgarī script. The original script of this record and the process of

its decipherment are unknown. The Purī list has more than one hundred and forty names, but Dvārakā lists about seventy names. The Kāñcī list is as long as that of Dvārakā. Candraśekharendra Sarasvatī (1983) upholds a fifth-century BCE date for Śaṅkara and rejects much of standard Indian history, beginning with the identification of Megasthenes' Sandrocottus with Candragupta of the Maurya dynasty.

20. The Śṛṅgeri list has thirty-six names, and its tradition gives Śaṅkara's date as the fourteenth year of Vikramāditya. If this were to be interpreted as fourteen Vikrama era, we would get a first-century date, but it has been suggested that the actual reference may be to a seventh- or eighth-century Cālukya king of the same name. Tapasyānanda (1980: xii–xiii) quotes a letter from the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* that leaves the date and identity of this Vikramāditya open to historical analysis and interpretation.

21. The Datta *sampradāya* in Maharashtra regards one Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī (fifteenth century) as an incarnation of Dattātreya. The twelfth chapter of *Śrī Gurucaritra* (1975), a hagiography of Nṛsiṃha written by Gaṅgādhara Sarasvatī, gives the same set of names between Śaṅkara and Vidyāraṇya as in the Śṛṅgeri list, although in a slightly different order. The lineage diverges thereafter, starting with the name of one Malayānanda who is not on the Śṛṅgeri list. This indicates that Śṛṅgeri's traditional pre-Vidyāraṇya lineage must have been determined at least as early as the fifteenth century. Nṛsiṃha was a Daśanāmī *saṃnyāsin* and seems to have been connected to the Advaita Vedānta tradition of Śṛṅgeri (Rigopoulos 1998: 237).

22. Hacker is silent about the Kāñcī *maṭha* and only mentions the four *āmnāya maṭhas* in a general fashion. Śṛṅgeri accounts acknowledge that the fourteenth century marked a turning point in the *maṭha*'s history, when Vidyāraṇya's leadership transformed a forest hermitage into an influential institution with intimate connections to Vijayanagara (K. Venkataraman 1959).

23. Ghurye (1953) and Sarkar (1946) do not mention the Kāñcī *maṭha* at all. Giri (1976: 15–17) says that the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s origin is controversial and that the four *āmnāya maṭhas* form the historical nucleus of all Daśanāmī orders. Giri's list of roughly fifty additional *maṭhas* in Daśanāmī *akhāḍā* records includes a 'Kumbhoṇ' *maṭha* (Kumbhakoṇam?), but not Kāñcīpuram.

24. Due to the current rivalry between Kāñcī and Śṛṅgeri *maṭhas*, this might seem rather partial towards Śṛṅgeri. However, as noticed by Dazey (1987) in a critical discussion of the Advaita tradition, it is impossible not to characterize the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s claims as being highly exaggerated. Kāñcī can legitimately claim a longer history than the newly revived Badrināth *maṭha*. However, it should also be noted that the very impetus given to revive the Badrināth *maṭha* came from the memory of its old status as the Uttarāmnāya institution.

Numerous other extinct *maṭha*s have not been revived.

25. Pande (1994) also failed to locate manuscripts of both works. He mentions another *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya*, by one Brahmānanda Sarasvatī, which probably dates to the seventeenth or eighteenth century.

26. *Suṣamā* attributes four verses to *Vyāsācalīya* and six verses to *Keralīya* that are not found in the corresponding manuscripts and that also contradict other details in these works. Aiyar and Venkataraman (1977: 68–70) give a more detailed list of misquotations, attributions to unknown authors, and 'quotations' of verses not found in any of the cited sources.

27. Tapasyānanda (1983: ix–xv) characterizes Narayana Sastri's claims about manuscripts of Citsukha's *Śaṅkaravijaya* as being highly unreliable. Antarkar (1960: 114) identifies Citsukha as the thirteenth-century author of the *Tattva-pradīpikā* (also called *Citsukhī*) and a disciple of Jñānottama.

28. *Mādhavīya* (1.1) reads (B. Upadhyaya 1967: 1):

> *praṇamya paramātmānaṃ śrīvidyātīrtha-rūpiṇam.*
> *prācīna śaṅkarajaye sāraḥ saṅgṛhyate sphuṭam.*

> Saluting the highest Self in the form of Śrī Vidyā Tīrtha, the essence of the ancient *Śaṅkarajaya* is now set forth.

Acyutarāya (Antarkar 1960: 118–19) comments:

> *prācīna iti—ye hi sūtrabhāṣyādi ṭīkākārāḥ śuddhānanda-bhagavatpūjyapāda-śiṣyāḥ bhagavad-anandajñānākhyāḥ ānandagiritvena prasiddhāḥ tad-racitaḥ yaḥ prakṛta granthaḥ prācīnaḥ cirantanaḥ śaṅkaravijayaḥ tatra...evam api prācīnaśaṅkaravijayasya eva.*

> 'Ancient'—this is the old text that was composed by the author of subcommentaries on the various commentaries, namely Bhagavān Ānandajñāna, also known as Ānandagiri, who was the disciple of Śuddhānanda Bhagavatpūjya-pāda—this is also only [a summary] of the *Prācīna Śaṅkaravijaya.*

29. '*ānandagiri-viracite bṛhacchaṅkaravijaye yathā*' (As in the *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya*, composed by Ānandagiri)—Acyutarāya on *Mādhavīya* 15.3, followed by fifty-eight verses (Antarkar 1960: 118).

30. '*bṛhacchaṅkaravijaya eva śrīmad-ānandajñānākhya-ānandagiri-viracite*' (In the *Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya*, composed by Ānandagiri, also called Ānandajñāna) —Acyutarāya on *Mādhavīya* 16.103, followed by a quotation found in *Śivarahasya* (Antarkar 1960: 118; Veezhinathan 1971: iii).

31. Rama Sastri (1976: 29, 59) says that the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s *Suṣamā* quotes from a *Prācīna Śaṅkaravijaya* of Mūkakavi. However, he also refers to Acyutarāya's commentary on *Mādhavīya* 1.1 and insists that Mādhava refers to Ānandagiri's *Prācīna Śaṅkaravijaya*. He seems to postulate two different texts of the same name, written by two different authors. Interestingly, manuscripts of this *Prācīna Śaṅkaravijaya* of Mūkakavi are also 'missing.'

32. Burnell (1880: 96), Mayeda (1992: 7), and Wilson (1977: 14) give this author's name as Ānandagiri. Both the nineteenth-century printed editions of this text from Calcutta are attributed to Ānandagiri, but chapter colophons consistently refer only to Anantānandagiri (Antarkar 1961: 74). The two old Calcutta editions are: J. V. Bhattacharya (1881) and Tarkapanchnana and Goswami (1982).

33. '*anantānandagiriḥ aham apratihata-śiṣyaḥ bhagavataḥ mama parama-guroḥ avatāra-kathām...*' (I, Anantānandagiri, a direct disciple of the Bhagavān [now relate] the story of the incarnation of my supreme teacher...)—chapter one. The text repeatedly lists Anantānandagiri among Śaṅkara's disciples.

34. The long quotation in chapter 11 begins,

avicāryaṃ vicāryaṃ vā brahmādhyāsānirūpaṇāt.
asandeha-aphalatvābhyāṃ na vicāram tad arhati.

Whether investigated into or not, the superimposition on Brahman is not founded; being pointless and also beyond doubt, it does not really merit any investigation,

and ends, '*tad upāsanāyāḥ phalam apy uktam eva bhāṣye*' (The fruit of that worship is also mentioned in the commentary itself). Chapter 47 even gives the name:

ata āha adhikaraṇa-ratnamālāyāṃ—
pāriplavārtham ākhyānaṃ kiṃ vā vidyāstutiḥ stuteḥ.
jyāyaḥ anuṣṭhānaśeṣatvaṃ tena pāriplavārthatāḥ.

Thus it is said in the *Adhikaraṇa Ratnamālā*—this description is meant either for *pāriplava* [the cycle of legends related during the *aśvamedha* sacrifice] or for the purpose of extolling knowledge; the full performance of the ritual being better than mere praise, it is for the purpose of *pāriplava*,

and continues with an explanation, which is attributed to Śaṅkara himself.

35. In both chapters, the quotations from the *Adhikaraṇa Ratnamālā* are

crucial for the philosophical arguments being made. There is no evidence to think that these are late additions to an earlier text that may have originated from a pre-fourteenth-century period.

36. Thus, Cenkner (1983: 108) erroneously attributes this text to the *ṭīkākāra*, whom he also wrongly assumes to have been Śaṅkara's direct disciple, and then concludes that this text is the most ancient and authentic one! It bears reiteration that (*i*) Ānandagiri, the *ṭīkākāra*, was a disciple of Śuddhānanda, not of Śaṅkara; (*ii*) Anantānandagiri should not be identified with the *ṭīkākāra*; and (*iii*) Anantānandagiri was not a direct disciple of Śaṅkara.

37. Burnell (1880: 96) refers to a printed edition from Madras. Aiyar and Venkataraman (1977: 125) say that this edition was prepared by Śivarāmaśāstrī and Subbāśāstrī of Madras, printed at a Sarasvatī Vilāsa Press and published in 1867 by one Veṅkaṭasubbāśāstrī.

38. The commentary to Śṛṅgeri's *Guruvaṃśakāvya* mentions a hagiographic text written by Ānandagiri, the *ṭīkākāra*. Antarkar takes this as a reference to the *Anantānandagirīya* and remarks: 'This *kāvya* is undoubtedly a Śṛṅgeri mutt work and I leave it to scholars to draw their own conclusions in the matter' (1961: 77). This overlooks his own arguments about the lost text of the *ṭīkākāra* (Antarkar 1960) and against identifying that work with the *Anantānandagirīya* (1961) and ignores the similar distinction consistently made by Śṛṅgeri followers.

39. This may be seen as possible textual evidence for the tradition that Śaṅkara systematized the notion of *ṣaṇmata* (six faiths). However, the inclusion of the Kāpālika tradition, instead of Kaumāra, is quite surprising, as the Kāpālikas are routinely depicted in a negative light in classical accounts.

40. *mahīpūrvabhāgaṃ lakṣmaṇācāryaḥ kila digvijayaṃ kṛtvā kāṃścid brāhmaṇādīn chidra-ūrdhva-puṇḍra-dhāraṇa-śaṅkha-cakrāṅka-bhāsura-bhujayugalān kṛtvā...paramagurucaraṇaṃ natvā tadanujñāvaśāt matavijṛmbhaṇahetukaṃ bhāṣyādigranthacayam akarot. hastāmalakas tu bhūmadhyāt paścima khaṇḍa digvijayaṃ kṛtvā pañcamudrāṅkita virājitān bhagavad aṣṭākṣara mantra japāsaktān kāṃścid brāhmaṇādīn kṛtvā rajatapīṭhasthaleṣu kṛṣṇādi pratiṣṭhāṃ kṛtvā...punaḥ paramagurum prāpa.*

The teacher Lakṣmaṇa, having conquered the eastern part of the earth, made some Brāhmaṇas wear the vertical mark on their foreheads and the marks of the conch and discus on their shoulders,...returned to the great teacher [Śaṅkara], and, under his command, wrote commentaries and other texts in order to expound his doctrine. Hastāmalaka went to the West, made some Brāhmaṇas wear the five marks, taught them the eight-syllabled *mantra* of the

Lord, consecrated Kṛṣṇa and other deities at Rajatapīṭha [Uḍupi] and other places,...and returned to the great teacher [Śaṅkara] (Veezhinathan 1971: 188).

41. There is a Madhva tradition that Hastāmalaka consecrated a Kṛṣṇa idol at Uḍupi (Govindachar 1995: 32) that may have found its way into this text. It should be noted that the Madhva tradition has also produced many texts that may be called anti-hagiographies of Śaṅkara. This gains significance for the rejection of *Anantānandagirīya* by the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*.

42. Antarkar remarks: 'It is again the other works, particularly that of Mādhava and those that follow him [works of Sadānanda and Nīlakaṇṭha] that are guilty of the most glaring anachronisms. No such anachronism is found in Anantā's work' (1961: 79).

43. Antarkar's (1992b, 1996) recent papers reveal his reasons for placing greater belief in Kāñcī sources. He thinks that the original Śaṅkara lived in the fifth century BCE and that it was a different Śaṅkara who lived in the eighth century CE. In support, he cites a text named *Śaṅkarendra Vilāsa*, manuscripts of which are also 'missing' but quoted in the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s *Suṣamā*.

44. Intriguingly, Weber (1967: 300, 317–18) also mentions a *maṭha* at Śaṅkeśvara that is historically related to the Karavīrapīṭha but seems quite unaware of all other *maṭha*s, including Dvārakā, Purī, and Badrināth. His identification of Madhva, the teacher of Dvaita Vedānta, with Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya of Śṛṅgeri, reveals another confusion based on mere similarity of names.

45. An assumption that the Kumbhakoṇam *maṭha* and the Kāñcī *maṭha* are separate institutions is also clearly seen in Fuller's (1984: 193) recent study of the Madurai Mīnākṣī temple priests.

46. Ayodhyā, Mathurā, Māyā (Haridvār), Kāśī, Kāñcī, Avantikā (Ujjain), and Dvārakā are the most commonly listed seven *mokṣapurī*s in the Purāṇas.

47. Devasenapati's (1975) and many other Kāñcī *maṭha* publications include the same pictures. These authors draw particular attention to the fact that a number of these *ekadaṇḍī saṃnyāsin* sculptures are seen in Vaiṣṇava temples, currently managed by Śrīvaiṣṇava *tridaṇḍī saṃnyāsin*s. However, they do not consider the possibility that these sculptures may represent not Śaṅkara but Madhvācārya of Dvaita Vedānta, which is a Vaiṣṇava tradition of *ekadaṇḍī saṃnyāsa*. Moreover, the mere presence of such sculptures in temples belonging to other traditions is no proof for the claim that the Kāñcī *maṭha* was established by Śaṅkara himself.

48. This equation of Anantānandagiri's text with Ānandagiri's *Prācīna/Bṛhat* text leads me to conclude that the Kāñcī *maṭha* possesses no manuscripts of any other texts known by these names.

49. Veezhinathan's footnote says, '*iti sarvāsu matṛkāsu*' (in all manuscripts).

The 1971 edition lists manuscripts obtained from the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, where P. P. Subrahmanya Sastri and S. Kuppuswami Sastri were once curators. Note that Subrahmanya Sastri's foreword to Kuppuswami Sastri's (1982: ix) edition of Maṇḍana Miśra's *Brahmasiddhi* says that chapter 63 of the *Anantānandagirīya* mentions Sureśvara as the head of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*! Veezhinathan (1972) has also edited Sarvajñātman's *Saṃkṣepa Śārīraka*; his introduction quotes his *Anantānandagirīya* edition and makes much of the words *samīpa* and *āśrayā* in its comments about Śṛṅgeri. Clearly, these comments need to be viewed in the context of Kāñcī *maṭha*'s claim that Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* is a branch of Kūḍalī *maṭha*, which is near Śṛṅgeri (*samīpa*).

50. Mahadevan (Veezhinathan 1971: iii–v) quotes Antarkar (1961: 75) who quotes Acyutarāya: '*anantānandagiry ukta śaṅkaravijaye tu kālaṭy ākhya grāmavarye*' (In the *Śaṅkaravijaya* of Anantānandagiri, it is said, 'in the great village of Kālaṭi'). I have been unable to verify this quotation.

51. '*sākṣāt cidambareśa iva virājamānaḥ*' (Seated like the very lord of Cidambaram) (Veezhinathan 1971: 11).

52. Śiva has a different name at each temple, for example, Rāmeśvara in Rāmeśvaram, Aruṇācaleśvara in Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, and so on. Cidambareśa is a definite reference to the temple at Cidambaram.

53. Candraśekharendra Sarasvatī (1980: 47) says that only this *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā* gives complete information about these Śiva-*liṅgas*. I have been unable to locate it in any of the various editions of the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*. It is obviously different from the well-known *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* and also different from a Pāñcarātra text called *Mārkaṇḍeya Saṃhitā*, which was published by the Tirumala Tirupati Devasthānam in 1984.

54. Rama Sastri (1976: 61) also misquotes Mallinātha. He maintains that Mallinātha says, '*sphaṭikaliṅge* yogeśvara *iti prasiddhiḥ*,' and that the printed edition's reading of *yāgeśvara* is only a typographical error. I leave it to readers to draw their own conclusions about his claims.

55. The *Pañcadaśī* analyzes only these four sentences in its fifth chapter, titled 'Mahāvākyaviveka' (Mahadevan 1976). The *Dharmasindhu* of K. Upadhyaya (1986: 392) reads:

> *pañcīkaraṇādy avabodhya, prajñānam brahma, ayam ātmā brahma, tat tvam asi, aham brahma asmi iti ṛgvedādi mahāvākyeṣv anyatamaṃ śiṣya śākhānusāreṇa upadiśya tad arthaṃ bodhayet.*

> After teaching *Pañcīkaraṇa*, one of the great sentences from the *Ṛg Veda* and others, 'Consciousness is Brahman,' 'This self is Brahman,' 'You are that,' and 'I am Brahman,' is to be imparted according to the disciple's Vedic

branch, and its meaning must be taught.

Vāsudevāśrama's *Yatidharmaprakāśa* (Olivelle 1976) quotes *Pañcīkaraṇa* and lists the same four sentences. Bharati (1965: 147–48) quotes a *Mantramuktāvalī* that provides the same list and associates them with the four *maṭhas*: '*iti paramahaṃsa catvāri maṭha dīkṣā*' (This is the initiation at the four *maṭhas* of the *paramahaṃsa* monks).

56. *Bhagavad Gītā* 17.23 reads, '*oṃtatsad iti nirdeśo brahmaṇaḥ trividhaḥ smṛtaḥ*' (It is remembered that Brahman is denoted in three ways, as *oṃ*, *tat*, and *sat*).

57. A variant reading of the *Pañcīkaraṇa* has *śrutibhyaḥ* for *vākyebhyaḥ*. I have discussed the authorship of this text elsewhere (Sundaresan 2002). Here, it is sufficient to note the important place given to this text in *saṃnyāsa* initiation (note 55 above).

58. *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* says that *oṃ* is an *akṣara* (syllable), not a *vākya* or a *mahāvākya*, denoting Brahman. The *smṛti* is *Bhagavad Gītā* (8.13), which reads '*oṃ ity ekākṣaraṃ brahma*' (The one syllable *oṃ* is Brahman).

59. To my knowledge, '*neha nānāsti kiṃcana*' has never been claimed to be a *mahāvākya*.

60. Vide, '*evaṃ mahāvākya-catuṣṭayasya upadeśād eva śiṣyasya śravaṇa-siddhau jātāyāṃ tad vākyārtha vicāra rūpam*' (The disciple's reflection upon the meaning of the sentences is born only from the teaching of the four great sentences) and '*tad upadeśa prakāraḥ api mahāvākya-catuṣṭayasya rūpa eva*' (The method of teaching is also in the form of the four great sentences). Anantānandagiri's reference to the *Śukarahasya Upaniṣad* reads, '*rahasyavede mahādevaḥ kila śukasya upadeśaṃ kṛtavān ity uktam*' (In the *Rahasyaveda*, it is said that Mahādeva taught Śuka in the same way) (Veezhinathan 1971: 146). In the *Śukarahasya Upaniṣad*, Śiva-Mahādeva instructs Śuka: '*atha mahavākyāni catvāri. yathā oṃ prajñānam brahma oṃ aham brahma asmi oṃ tat tvam asi oṃ ayam ātmā brahma iti*' (Now, the great sentences are four in number, namely, 'Consciousness is Brahman,' 'I am Brahman,' 'You are that,' and 'This self is Brahman') (J. Sastri 1970, 1: 258).

61. Some Upaniṣads mention three or seven *mahāvākyas* (Sprockhoff 1976: 166, 280, 385), while Mayeda (1992: 66) cites a text that lists twelve *mahāvākyas*. However, my criticism of Veezhinathan is on solid ground. Anantānandagiri explicitly uses the term *mahāvākya-catuṣṭaya* and refers to the *Śukarahasya Upaniṣad*, a text that lists four *mahāvākyas*. This clearly endorses only the tradition of four *mahāvākyas* used for *upadeśa* during monastic initiation.

62. The identification of Vidyāraṇya with a Mādhava is a complicated issue

and has been the subject of many debates, but this is not very crucial for the rest of this discussion.

63. Dhanapatisūrin's chronogram gives the date of completion of the *Ḍiṇḍima*: '*pāndava-iṣv-ahi-tāreśa-pramite*' (Sawai 1992: 23). This is the year 1855 Vikrama era, which is 1798–99 CE. The work was completed in the Śrāvaṇa month, which would have been in 1798 CE.

64. The earliest edition mentioned by Mayeda (1992: 7) dates to 1864. The Śṛṅgeri edition was published in 1956 and again in 1972, in addition to older printings in the nineteenth century.

65. Reddiar (1987) claims that Kumbhakoṇam *maṭha* won the Akhilāṇḍeśvarī *tāṭaṅka-pratiṣṭhā* lawsuit against the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* (see note 18 above). Sharma (1987) says that the court merely dismissed the case and advised the temple authorities to make their own decisions regarding the *tāṭaṅka-pratiṣṭhā* ceremony.

66. There is yet another claim of the Kāñcī *maṭha* with respect to this text. Candraśekharendra Sarasvatī (1980: 1–5, 83–84) says that the author of the *Mādhavīya* has written an auto-commentary on it. Mahadevan, the translator, does not expand upon this, but only the two commentaries by Dhanapatisūrin and Acyutarāya are known. The implication seems to be that Dhanapatisūrin, the earlier commentator, is himself the author of the *Mādhavīya*.

67. Antarkar (1972: 21) claims that B. Upadhyaya supports his stance on Mādhava Bhaṭṭa and *Bhārata Campū*. However, Upadhyaya (1967: 1) explicitly identifies Vidyāraṇya as the author of the *Mādhavīya*, saying, '*grantha ke racayitā svāmī vidyāraṇya haiṃ*' (The author of the text is Svāmī Vidyāraṇya). Rama Sastri (1976: 55–56) claims that Mādhava Bhaṭṭa is the author of a *Bhāgavata Campū*. The Library of Congress catalog lists one *Bhārata Campū* by an Anantakavi and two *Bhāgavata Campū* texts, one of which is attributed to an Abhinava Kālidāsa. Note that the name Navakālidāsa is found in the first chapter of the *Mādhavīya Śaṅkaravijaya*.

68. B. Upadhyaya (1967: xi–xxii) reproduces messages from leaders of various Daśanāmī institutions, many of whom particularly mention this debate. Thurman (1991: 37) describes a very similar debate in Tibetan Buddhist hagiography, including an identical theme of an annual *śrāddha* ritual. This seems to be related to the tension between householder and monastic ideals.

69. For example, *Mādhavīya* (3.8) uses the words '*iti kecit*' to describe a variant tradition.

70. *Mādhavīya* (5.99) reads:

svaminn aham na pṛthivī na jalaṃ na tejaḥ na sparśanaḥ na gaganaṃ na ca tadguṇāḥ vā. na api indriyāṇy api tu viddhi tataḥ avaśistaḥ yaḥ kevalaḥ asti

paramaḥ sa śivaḥ aham asmi.

Sir, I am not the earth or water or fire or air or space, nor am I their qualities; I am not the senses; I am the one Śiva, who is alone, supreme, and beyond all these.

Antarkar feels that no genuine disciple would have spoken thus to his *guru* and therefore accuses Mādhava of not depicting Śaṅkara in a positive manner. However, he also thinks that the above verse is originally from the *Patañjali-carita*. He should have really leveled this criticism not against Mādhava, but against Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita!

71. Thus, Śaṅkara is said to have always been a *vidvat saṃnyāsin* (one who renounces the world because Brahman-knowledge has already arisen), not a *vividiṣā saṃnyāsin* (one who renounces the world because of a desire to know Brahman).

72. The *Hastāmalaka ślokas* read very similarly, with the refrain '*sa nityopalabdhi-svarūpaḥ aham ātmā*' (I am the Self, of the nature of eternal consciousness). An English translation of this set of verses may be found in Potter (1981: 601–2).

73. A *bhāṣya* is an independent commentary on a primary source text. A *ṭīkā* consists of annotations on a *bhāṣya*. A *vṛtti* is akin to a *bhāṣya*, in that it develops the source text and explores its philosophical implications. A *vṛtti* may be either on a primary source text or on a *bhāṣya*. A *vārttika* is a critical subcommentary on a *bhāṣya* that examines that which is well said (*sūktam*), that which is said imperfectly (*duruktam*), and what is left unsaid (*anuktam*).

74. In fact, Mādhava's account is perfectly consistent with the meanings of these terms. Some disciples are jealous that Śaṅkara asks Sureśvara to write a *vārttika*. Others are suspicious that he would misuse the opportunity and compromise the Advaita teaching, as he had been a Pūrva Mīmāṃsaka until recently, having only converted after a tough debate. They also think that the master's work does not need a critical *vārttika* and suggest that a simpler *ṭīkā* is sufficient.

75. However, note that Tripathi's introduction to Ānandagiri's *Tarka-saṅgraha* (1917) gives a tradition that places Ānandagiri at Dvārakā. On the other hand, in the *ṭīkā* on Sureśvara's *vārttika* on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Bhāṣya* (Subrahmanya Sastri 1982: 1), Ānandagiri himself pays homage to Viṣṇu at Nīlādri (modern Purī). Vyāsācala's identity is highly uncertain, while the date given by the Kāñcī *maṭha* for Paramaśivendra Sarasvatī is too early by at least a century.

76. '*vyāsācala pramukha pūrvika paṇḍita kṣmābhṛtsambhṛta uccatara kāvya-*

taroḥ sugūḍhāt. vidvanmadhuvrata sukhorurasāni sarvāṇyādātum artha-kusumāny aham akṣamaḥ asmi' (Vyāsācala and other earlier scholars have composed trees of poetry on earth; I am unable to extract and present all the essences of the flowers on them). This verse is said to be obtained from a *Mādhavīya* manuscript (numbered D 12174) at the Oriental Library, Madras. Antarkar (1972: 2) reads *surīteḥ*, instead of *sugūḍhāt*, in the first line. This verse is different from *Mādhavīya* 1.17, which has the words, '*dhanyaḥ saḥ vyāsācala-kavivaraḥ*' (Blessed is the great poet, Vyāsācala).

77. The second verse supplied by Mahādeva Śāstrī, as given by Antarkar (1972: 2), reads, '*yatnādudalpadhiṣaṇāsṛṇinā grahītum śakyam tad atra sarasaṃ sakalaṃ gṛhītvā. kāñcin maheśvara gurusmṛti bhinnamohaḥ saṃkṣepa-śaṅkara-jayasrajam ātanomi*' (I present the *Saṃkṣepa Śaṅkarajaya* after grasping the essence to the best of my ability, being blessed by my teacher's memory).

78. Śiva is said to have appeared on the banks of the river Gaṅgā in the form of a Cāṇḍāla to test Śaṅkara's level of Brahman-realization.

79. *Mādhavīya* (4.11) reads, '*śivaguruḥ sa jaran trisame śiśau amṛta-karma-vaśaḥ sutamoditaḥ. upaninīṣita sūnuḥ api svayam na hi yamaḥ asya kṛtākṛtam īkṣate*' (In the third year of the child, the old Śivaguru took delight in his son, but the uninitiated son knew that the god of death was already watching for his [the father's] last days). Verse 11.116 of Vyāsācala (Chandrasekharan 1954) has a variant reading in the first two quatrains, '*trisama eva śiśoḥ janakaḥ jarann amṛta-karmavaśaḥ sutamoditaḥ*,' but note that *Suṣamā* explicitly identifies Vyāsācala as the author of the reading found only in the *Mādhavīya*. This may be a minor variation in the reading of the verse, but it is very curious that in a narrative that is otherwise chronologically ordered, the story of Śaṅkara's *upanayana* occurs very late in the 1954 *Vyāsācalīya* text. In the twelve chapters in this text, such an early event as an *upanayana* occurs only in the eleventh chapter, much later than the account of Śaṅkara's *saṃnyāsa* days.

80. This worsens (close to 50 percent) if we compare these three hundred thirty-three verses to only the unshared verses.

81. Dhanapatisūrin, author of *Ḍiṇḍima* and *Dundubhi*, was from Punjab. He was a disciple of a Bālagopāla Tīrtha and a son-in-law of Sadānanda, author of *Śaṅkaravijaya Sāra*. Acyutarāya, who was from Maharashtra, became a *saṃnyāsin* under the name Gopālendra Sarasvatī.

82. Verse 8.111 has the words, '*kāmeśvarīm anudinam arcayan brahmā-nandam avindata*' (Worshipping the goddess Kāmeśvarī daily, he [Śaṅkara] experienced the bliss of Brahman) (Radhakrishna Sastri 1986: 110). Note the close similarity between this and an earlier verse (5.49) in the context of Śaṅkara worshipping the goddess Mīnākṣī at Madurai, which reads, '*anudinam iti devīm arcayan...cintānirvṛto babhūva*' (Thus, worshipping the goddess daily,...he

[Śaṅkara] became free of all worries). This is not interpreted to mean that Śaṅkara established a *maṭha* at Madurai or that he spent his last days there. Rama Sastri and others like to apply a different interpretive standard only to verse 8.111 and Kāñcīpuram.

83. Verses 7.71–85 of this *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* are based on the fifteen-syllable Śrīvidyā-*mantra* (*ka-e-ī-la-hrīṃ, ha-sa-ka-ha-la-hrīṃ, sa-ka-la-hrīṃ*), with consecutive verses beginning with these seed syllables in order. The same pattern is found in verses 7.87–92, with respect to the six-syllable *mantra* (*aiṃ-hrīṃ-śrīṃ, aiṃ-klīṃ-sauḥ*). These two *mantra*s and *oṃ* are often combined together in ritual practice.

The seventh chapter also refers to the poet's ancestors: '*pavitrayann atra saḥ bhaikṣacaryayā svayaṃ bhavasvāmi sudhīniketanam*' (Sanctifying the home of Bhavasvāmin, by visiting it for food; 7.40ab) and '*nirīkṣamāṇaḥ pathi satyamaṅgalaṃ nivāsayogyaṃ maṇikheṭayajvanaḥ*' (Visiting Satyamaṅgalam on the way, a village fit for the residence of Maṇikheṭa Yajvan; 7.44ab). Maṇikheṭa Yajvan was the poet's father, while Bhavasvāmin was an earlier ancestor (Radhakrishna Sastri 1986: 85–86).

84. Rājacūḍāmaṇi's salutation of his *guru* and his lineage reads:

śarvaryāḥ carame yāme śayānaḥ sa kadācana.
gīrvāṇendra guruṃ buddhyā gīrvāṇendram alokata.
...paryāya śaṅkarācāryaṃ pāre vācām avasthitam.
prapañcasāra pramukha prabandha kṛti vedhasam.

Once while lying down towards the end of the day, he saw in his mind his teacher, Gīrvāṇendra,...who was a Śaṅkarācārya in regular order, who was established in the highest Word, and who was an adept in many works, beginning with the *Prapañcasāra*.

Verse 1.58 describes Śaṅkara's composition: '*mantrāgama mahāmbhodhiṃ mathitvā buddhi manthataḥ. prapañcasāra pramukha prabandhāmṛtam ādade*' (By churning the great ocean of *mantra*s, with his intellect as the churning rod, he produced the nectar of texts, beginning with the *Prapañcasāra*) (Radhakrishna Sastri 1986: 3ff.).

85. Śarmā is a properly Brāhmaṇa surname, while Guptā is usually a Vaiśya surname. The *Patañjalicarita* reference may be to Candrācārya of the northern Cāndra *vyākaraṇa* tradition, who is said to have studied Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* in the south (Aklujkar 1991: 2–3).

86. The *Mādhavīya* identifies Maṇḍana Miśra with Viśvarūpa and with Sureśvara. Many Advaita writers consistently attribute quotations from

Sureśvara to a Viśvarūpa. Kuppuswami Sastri's (1982) edition of *Brahmasiddhi* rejects the identification of Maṇḍana with Sureśvara.

87. The only exception seems to be Puruṣottama Bhāratī's *Śaṅkaravijaya Saṅgraha* (the *Kūṣmāṇḍa Śaṅkaravijaya*), which says that the Śāradā temple was consecrated at a place called Pammāpura (Antarkar 1962: 12). This might be a reference to Pampāpura, an old name of Hampi, the Vijayanagara capital. Vidyāraṇya is said to have established the Virūpākṣa *maṭha* here, with an associated Śāradā temple.

88. '*katicana viniveśya atha ṛṣyaśṛṅgāśramādau*' (Dispatching some to the *āśrama* of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga and other places) (*Mādhavīya* 16.93).

89. Chapters 21 through 23 of the *Śaṅkaravijaya Vilāsa* of Cidvilāsa (Antarkar 1973) describe Śaṅkara's stay at the *vibhāṇḍaka tapovanam*. Vibhāṇḍaka is the name of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga's father in the *Mahābhārata* and Śṛṅgeri is the Kannada form of Ṛṣyaśṛṅgagiri, but Antarkar's introduction professes not to recognize this connection. Chapter 25 describes the Kāñcīpuram Sarvajñapīṭha.

90. The *Prapañcasāra* is a very important text from another perspective as well. It is usually assumed that although the Śākta Śrīvidyā tradition is nowadays closely associated with the Advaita *maṭhas* in the south, it has an independent origin in Kāśmīra Śaiva tradition (Brooks 1992). However, the *Prapañcasāra* has itself been a standard reference for many Śākta Tantric authors, and the fact that Advaita tradition associates its composition with Kāśmīra is perhaps significant. Padoux (1990: 66) assumes that this text dates to the thirteenth century and ascribes it to Vidyāśaṅkara, but Pande (1994: 127, 369) points out that Amalānanda's *Vedāntakalpataru*, an early thirteenth-century text, already attributes the *Prapañcasāra* to Śaṅkara. A study of the legends about the Sarvajñapīṭha in conjunction with the authorship of *Prapañcasāra* may offer interesting insights into the origins and growth of variant *maṭha* traditions.

91. Govindanātha's verses (9.1–3) read:

sarvajñaḥ śiṣya-saṃyuktaḥ śankaraḥ deśikeśvaraḥ.
bhūmiṃ pradakṣiṇīkṛtya bhūyaḥ kāñcīpuraṃ gataḥ.
jambūdvīpasya kurvāṇe śobhāṃ bhārata maṇḍale.
śastaṃ kāśmīra nāmānaṃ desaṃ vidyotuman bhṛsam.
kāmākṣyā nāma vāgdevyāḥ sthānaṃ tat puram āptavān.
sarvajñapīṭham āroḍhum iyeṣa yati puṅgavaḥ.

The omniscient Śaṅkara, the king of teachers, accompanied by his disciples, came again to Kāñcīpuram, circumambulating the earth. In order to glorify the island of Jambū on earth, in the great country of Kāśmīra, the supreme ascetic

reached the city of Vāgdevī, the goddess of speech, also called Kāmākṣī, and desired to ascend the Sarvajñapīṭha, the throne of omniscience (Antarkar 1992a: 129).

92. Potter's introduction to Sureśvara also describes Śṛṅgeri as Śaṅkara's birthplace, which seems to be the result of some confusion. The Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* has never claimed that Śṛṅgeri itself is Śaṅkara's birthplace, as all its accounts mention Kālaṭi in this regard. However, until the beginning of the twentieth century, the exact location of this place remained largely unknown. In 1910, the then head of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* rediscovered Kālaṭi and established temples, Vedic schools, and a branch *maṭha* there. The introduction (Potter 1981: 420) then goes on to say that Sureśvara's name appears in the lists of all the *maṭha*s. The source for this statement remains unknown, as at least two *maṭha* lists do not include Sureśvara. Purī sources list either Padmapāda or Hastāmalaka, while Badrināth invariably names Toṭaka.

93. In some of his works, Sarvajñātman gives the name of his *guru* as Deveśvara. A late commentator equates this Deveśvara with Sureśvara, but it is quite improbable that Sarvajñātman was Śaṅkara's junior contemporary. The identity of Pṛthvīdhara remains unknown.

94. Cenkner ignores the Karavīrapīṭha and Sumerupīṭha, each of which claims to be the fifth *maṭha* established by Śaṅkara. He also ignores the Kerala tradition that Śaṅkara established four *maṭha*s (Vaḍakke, Tekke, Eḍayil, and Naḍuvil) at Trichūr, each in charge of one of his four disciples. This tradition is linked to the establishment of the Kerala calendar known as the Koḷḷam era and may also be correlated with Govindanātha's account of Śaṅkara's last days.

95. The Kāñcī *maṭha* has also made various claims about key post-Śaṅkaran Advaitins, including Vidyā Tīrtha and Vidyāraṇya, which have not been discussed in this paper. As noted earlier, the Kāñcī *maṭha* claims either a Dakṣiṇāmnāya or a *mūlāmnāya* status. However, in a recent joint statement issued in 1993 in connection with the Ayodhyā issue, Jayendra Sarasvatī of Kāñcī is silent about his *maṭha*'s *āmnāya* status, while the heads of the four *āmnāya maṭha*s are explicitly described as such. Still, his presence, along with the heads of the *āmnāya maṭha*s, is a measure of the growing political importance of this *maṭha*. Kāñcī was not represented in an earlier meeting of the Śaṅkarācāryas in Śṛṅgeri held in 1979.

96. Pande (1994: 370–71, and references cited therein) discusses this copper-plate inscription in great detail. Gopinatha Rao dates it to 1231 or 1291 CE. Krishna Sastri notes that these dates conflict with other astronomical data mentioned in the inscription and proposes a date of 1351 CE. The donor is a Gaṇḍagopāla from the Telugu Coḍa dynasty, described as a *tribhuvana-*

cakravartin (emperor of the three worlds) and as *cōḷa nareśvara* (overlord of the Cōḷa people). The dates proposed by Rao and Sastri are based upon varying identifications of this Gaṇḍagopāla. Pande says that 1351 is too late a date and accepts 1111 CE, as proposed by N. Ramesam, a Kāñcī *maṭha* devotee. Kāñcīpuram became part of Vijayanagara only in 1365 CE, but the history of this region in the mid-fourteenth century is not very clear. On the other hand, Ramesam's proposal of 1111 CE goes against all known Cōḷa history. Kulōttuṅka I, who inherited both the Cōḷa and eastern Cālukya kingdoms, ruled over almost all of the Tamil- and Telugu-speaking regions between 1070 and 1118 CE (Nilakantha Sastri 1958: 180–210). His inscriptions are found in all major Kāñcīpuram temples. In 1111 CE, a Telugu Coḍa named Gaṇḍagopāla may have ruled at Kāñcīpuram as a vassal, but he could not have described himself independently as a *tribhuvana-cakravartin* and a *cōḷa nareśvara* while he was subject to an overlord in Tañjāvūr. Thus, every proposed date from 1111 to 1351 CE seems problematic, and it is quite legitimate to ask whether this inscription is entirely a late forgery.

Even if the inscription were assumed to be authentic, there are other problems. The donee is a *dvija* named Śaṅkarārya (not Śaṅkarācārya) from the house of Poppilli, a Telugu family (*dvijanmane, poppilli prathitātmane*) who worships Śiva and who resides in a *maṭha* to the west of the Hastiśaila temple. The donee was probably a householder, as his name would correspond to Śaṅkarayyā or Śaṅkaraiyar in Telugu or Tamil. His description as a *dvija* militates against supposing that he was a Daśanāmī monk, and a Daśanāmī suffix or a reverential *svāmī* or *śrīpāda* is conspicuously absent. *Maṭhas* of the Advaita tradition are invariably headed by ascetics. The contemporary Advaita *maṭha* at Kāñcī is not located to the west of the Hastiśaila temple, and nothing in this inscription indicates the philosophical affiliations of this Śaṅkarārya. This inscription may, therefore, belong to any one of numerous Śaiva institutions in Kāñcīpuram.

97. The Śṛṅgeri Śaṅkarācāryas used to be honored with special palanquins and gun salutes in the southern princely states (K. Venkataraman 1959). This forms a subtext to the Kāñcī *maṭha*'s disputes with the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha*. Political relationships among the Nāyaka kingdoms that arose after the fall of Vijayanagara must have also played a role in such conflicts. Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita was a scholar at the Nāyaka court at Tañjāvūr (Radhakrishna Sastri 1986: v), a kingdom that arose in post-Vijayanagara times, while the Nāyakas of Ikkeri in Karnataka were patrons of the Śṛṅgeri *maṭha* (Swaminathan 1957). The Śaṅkara hagiographies and variant *maṭha* traditions may, therefore, have to be correlated with post-Vijayanagara Nāyaka history.

98. Hacker (1978: 479) considers the tradition of *maṭhas* to be entirely a fiction. He thinks that Vidyāraṇya set up Vidyāśaṅkara (Vidyā Tīrtha), his *guru*,

as the head of a new *maṭha* at Śṛṅgeri, then claimed that this *maṭha* had been established by Śaṅkara and that his *guru* had been the head of the *maṭha* all along.

> Er [= Vidyāraṇya] schuf Fiktionen, und gab aus, der Maṭha sei von Śaṅkara selber gegründet worden und habe seither dauernd bestanden....Er setzte zunächst den alten Vidyāśaṅkara als Vorsteher ein und gab aus, dieser habe dort schon seit Jahrzehnten gewirkt.

> He [Vidyāraṇya] created fictions and proclaimed that the *maṭha* had been established by Śaṅkara himself and had existed since then....He installed the old Vidyāśaṅkara as the head and proclaimed that he had occupied that position for many decades.

However, Kulke (1985: 135) thinks that Vidyā Tīrtha played a more decisive role in establishing a new *maṭha* and merely attributes this supposed fiction to Vidyā Tīrtha instead.

99. The boar emblem was used by the Cālukyas of Badami (seventh through ninth centuries) and Kalyāṇa (eleventh through twelfth centuries), by the Hoysaḷas in Karnataka and Tamilnadu (twelfth through thirteenth centuries), and, more recently, by the Mysore Wodeyars (seventeenth through twentieth centuries). Historically, the use of royal symbols in the Daśanāmī tradition is usually linked to Vidyāraṇya and his connection to Vijayanagara. However, the early thirteenth-century date for the seal in the name of Vidyāśankara indicates a probable prehistory to the connections between Advaita monks and royalty. Kulke (1985) seems to be unaware of this inscription, although it is documented in the *Epigraphia carnatica* (Rigopoulos 1998: 237).

100. It should be clear that I regard Mahadevan, Veezhinathan, and Antarkar as having been motivated by Kāñcī *maṭha* interests and as having misled other scholars who cite their publications. Even after allowing for considerable benefit of the doubt, I find it difficult not to conclude that critical scholarship has been deliberately manipulated, with a view to marginalize every tradition that is disagreeable to the Kāñcī *maṭha*.

References cited

Aiyangar, S. K. Nd. *Three great acharyas: Sankara, Ramanuja, Madhwa.* Madras: G. A. Natesan.

Aiyar, C. N. Krishnaswami. Nd. *Life and times of Sankara.* Madras: G. A.

Natesan.

Aiyar, R. Krishnaswami and K. R. Venkataraman. 1977. *The truth about the Kumbhakonam mutt.* Madurai: Ramakrishna Press.

Aiyer, A. Nataraja and S. Lakshminarasimha Sastri. 1962. *The traditional age of Sri Sankaracharya and the maths.* Madras: Minerva Press.

Aklujkar, Ashok. 1991. Interpreting *Vākyapadīya* 2.486 historically: Part 3. *In* Madhav M. Deshpande and Saroja Bhate, eds., *Paninian studies: Prof. S. D. Joshi felicitation volume,* 1–47. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies.

Anonymous. 1965. *Four Amnaya Pithas.* Dwaraka: Sri Navbharati Office.

Antarkar, W. R. 1960. The Bṛhat Śaṅkaravijaya of Citsukhācārya and the Prācīna Śaṅkaravijaya of Ānandagiri. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 29, 2: 113–21.

Antarkar, W. R. 1961. The Śaṅkaravijaya of Anantānandagiri. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 30, 2: 73–80.

Antarkar, W. R., ed. 1962. Śaṅkaravijaya Saṅgraha (Puruṣottama Bhāratī) (in Sanskrit; English introduction). *Oriental thought* 6, 1: 1–17.

Antarkar, W. R., ed. 1965. Śaṅkarābhyudaya (Tirumala Dīkṣita) (in Sanskrit; English introduction). *Journal of the University of Bombay* 34, 2: 139–87.

Antarkar, W. R. 1972. The Saṃkṣepa Śaṅkara Jaya of Mādhavācārya. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 41, 77: 1–23.

Antarkar, W. R., ed. 1973. Śrī Śaṅkaravijaya Vilāsa (Cidvilāsa) (in Sanskrit; English introduction). *Bhāratīya vidyā* 33, 1–4: 1–92.

Antarkar, W. R., ed. 1992a. Śaṅkarācāryacarita (Govindanātha) (in Sanskrit; English introduction). *Bhāratīya vidyā* 52, 1–4: 57–140.

Antarkar, W. R. 1992b. The date of Śaṅkarācārya. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay* 67: 117–20.

Antarkar, W. R. 1996. The place of Śaṅkara's final disappearance. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay* 71: 1–22.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1981. *Worship and conflict under colonial rule: A South Indian case.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bader, Jonathan. 1991. Conquest of the four quarters: Traditional accounts of the life of Śaṅkara. PhD dissertation. Canberra: Australian National University Library.

Bharati, Agehananda. 1965. *The Tantric tradition.* London: Rider.

Bhāratī Tīrtha. 1980. *Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā: Vedāntādhikaraṇanyāyamālā* (in Sanskrit). Pune: Ānandāśrama.

Bhattacharya, J. N. 1968 [1896]. *Hindu castes and sects.* Calcutta: Editions Indian.

Bhattacharya, Jibananda Vidyasagara, ed. 1881. *Śaṅkaravijaya* (Anantānanda-

giri) (in Sanskrit). Calcutta: Sarasudhānidhi Press.

Bīrūnī, Abū Raiḥān Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad. 1971. *Alberuni's India* (ed. Ainslie T. Embree). New York: Norton.

Bodas, M. R. 1923. *Śrī Śaṅkarācārya va tyāṃcā sampradāya* (in Marathi). Bombay: Np.

Brooks, Douglas R. 1992. *Auspicious wisdom: The texts and traditions of Śrīvidyā Śākta Tantrism in southern India.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Burnell, A. C. 1880. *A classified index to the Sanskrit mss. in the palace at Tanjore.* London: Trübner.

Cenkner, William. 1983. *A tradition of teachers: Śaṅkara and the Jagadgurus today.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Chandrasekharan, T., ed. 1954. *Śaṅkaravijaya (Vyāsācala)* (in Sanskrit; English Preface). Madras: Government Oriental Manuscripts Library.

Cinmayānanda, Svāmī. 1978. *Sankara: The missionary.* Bombay: Chinmaya Mission Trust.

Dakshinamurthy, N. S. 1973. *A review of Srisankaravijaya of Anantanandagiri.* Madras: City Printing Works.

Dazey, Wade H. 1987. The daśanāmī order and monastic life. PhD dissertation. Santa Barbara: University of California, Santa Barbara, Library.

Devasenapati, V. A. 1975. *Kamakottam, Nayanmars, and Adi Sankara.* Madras: University of Madras Institute of Traditional Cultures.

Dīkṣita, Rāmabhadra. 1934. *Patañjalicarita* (in Sanskrit). Bombay: Nirnayasāgara Press.

Encyclopedia Britannica. 1990 [1768]. *The encyclopedia Britannica.* Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.

Fuller, Christopher J. 1984. *Servants of the goddess: The priests of a South Indian temple.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ghate, V. S. 1924. Śaṅkarācārya. *In, Encyclopedia of religion and ethics* 11: 185–86. New York: Charles Scribner.

Ghurye, G. S. 1953. *Indian sadhus.* Bombay: Popular Book Depot.

Giri, Svāmī Sadānanda. 1976. *Society and sannyasin: A history of the dasnami sannyasins.* Rishikesh: Kriyayoga Ashram.

Govindachar, Bannanje. 1995. *Udupi: Past and present.* Udupi: Puttige Math.

Hacker, Paul. 1978. *Kleine Schriften* (ed. L. Schmithausen) (in German). Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Isayeva, Natalia. 1993. *Shankara and Indian philosophy.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kamakoti Sastri, C. 1981. *Śrī Kāmākṣī ampāḷ stala varalāṟu* (in Tamil). Madras: Shammi Syndicate Press.

King, Richard. 1999. *Orientalism and religion: Post-colonial theory, India, and 'the mystic East.'* London: Routledge.

Kulke, Hermann. 1969. Erklärung eines südindischen Māhātmyas: Die Legende Hiraṇyavarmans und das Leben des Cōḷa-Königs Kulottuṅga I (in German). *Saeculum* 20: 412–22.

Kulke, Hermann. 1985. Maharajas, mahants, and historians: Reflections on the historiography of early Vijayanagara and Sringeri. *In* Anna Libera Dallapiccola and Stephanie Zingel-Avé Lallemant, eds., *Vijayanagara: City and empire. New currents of research*, 120–43. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Kuppuswami Sastri, S., ed. 1982 [1937]. *Brahmasiddhi* (Sanskrit; English foreword and introduction). Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

Lincoln, Bruce. 1989. *Discourse and the construction of society: Comparative studies of myth, ritual, and classification.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lorenzen, David N. 1983. The life of Śaṅkarācārya. *In* Fred W. Clothey and J. Bruce Long, eds., *Experiencing Śiva: Encounters with a Hindu deity*, 155–75. New Delhi: Manohar.

Lorenzen, David N. 1987. Śaṅkara. *In*, *Encyclopedia of religion* 13: 64–65. New York: Macmillan.

Lütt, Jürgen. 1978. The Śaṅkarācārya of Purī. *In* Anncharlott Eschman, Hermann Kulke, and G. C. Tripathi, eds., *The cult of Jagannath and the regional tradition of Orissa*, 411–19. New Delhi: Manohar.

Mādhava. 1891. *Śrī Śaṅkaradigvijaya* (in Sanskrit). Pune: Ānandāśrama.

Mahadevan, T. M. P. 1960. *Gaudapada: A study in early Vedanta.* Madras: University of Madras.

Mahadevan, T. M. P. 1976. *The philosophy of Advaita, with special reference to Bharatitirtha-Vidyaranya.* New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann.

Mahadevan, T. M. P. 1983. *The sage of Kanchi.* Secunderabad: Kanchi Mahaswami Ninetieth Birthday Celebration Committee.

Mayeda, Sengaku. 1992. *A thousand teachings: The Upadeśasāhasrī of Śaṅkara.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Mines, Mattison and Vijayalakshmi Gourishankar. 1990. Leadership and individuality in South Asia: The case of the South Indian big-man. *Journal of Asian studies* 49, 4: 761–86.

Mohanty, M. P. 1997. Tradition in decline: How Puri's once thriving monasteries came to face extinction. *Hinduism today* 19, 11: 34–36.

Mutaliyar, A. Cinkaravelu. 1981. *Apitāna Cintāmaṇi: The encyclopedia of Tamil literature* (in Tamil). New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.

Narayana Sastri, T. S. 1916 [1910]. *The age of Śaṅkara.* Madras: B. G. Paul.

Nilakantha Sastri, K. A. 1958. *A history of South India.* Madras: Oxford

University Press.
Olivelle, J. Patrick, ed. 1976. *Vāsudevāśrama Yatidharmaprakāśa* (in Sanskrit). Vienna: University of Vienna Institute for Indology.
Padoux, André. 1990. *Vāc: The concept of the word in selected Hindu Tantras.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Pande, G. C. 1994. *Life and thought of Sankaracarya.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Patchen, Nancy. 1989. *The journey of a master: Swami Chinmayananda.* Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.
Pathak, K. B. 1882. The date of Śaṅkara. *Indian antiquary* 11: 174–75.
Potter, Karl H. 1981. *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies: Advaita Vedānta up to Śaṅkara and his pupils.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Potter, Karl H. 1982. Śaṃkarācārya: The myth and the man. *In* Michael A. Williams, ed., *Charisma and sacred biography,* 111–25. Chico: Scholars Press.
Radhakrishna Sastri, S. V., ed. 1986. *Śrī Śaṅkarābhyudayam: Śrī Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣitakrtam* (in Sanskrit). Trichy: Simili Venkatarama Sastri Trust.
Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli. 1989 [1923]. *Indian philosophy.* 2 vols. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
Raja, K. Kunjunni. 1960. On the date of Śaṃkarācārya and allied problems. *The Adyar Library bulletin* 24, 1–2: 125–48.
Rāma, Svāmī. 1989. *Living with the Himalayan masters.* Honesdale: Himalayan International Institute of Yoga Science and Philosophy.
Rama Sastri, Polakam. 1976. *Āticaṅkarar mutal Kāñcīyil toṭarntavaṟum kuruparamparai* (in Tamil). Madras: Liberty Patippakam.
Rāmakṛṣṇānanda, Svāmī. 1959. *The life of Sri Ramanuja.* Madras: Ramakrishna Math.
Reddiar, N. Krishnaswami. 1987. *Some judicial references and some administrative records regarding Shankaracharya mutts.* Madras: Bhavani Book Center.
Rigopoulos, Antonio. 1998. *Dattātreya: The immortal guru, yogin, and avatāra.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Sarasvatī, Candraśekharendra. 1980. *Adi Sankara: His life and times* (trans. T. M. P. Mahadevan). Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
Sarasvatī, Gaṅgādhara. 1975. *Śrī Gurucaritra: Sake 1702 madhīla prāsādika hastalikhita pothīvarān* (ed. Govinda Ātmārāma Gokhale) (in Marathi). Pune: Paraśurāma Press.
Sarasvatī, Paramaśivendra. 1991. *Daharavidyā Prakāśikā.* Varanasi: Sri Dakshinamurti Matha.
Sarkar, Jadunath. 1946. *A history of dasnami naga sannyasis.* Allahabad:

Mahanirvani Akhada.

Sastri, Jagadisalala, ed. 1970. *Upaniṣatsaṃgrahaḥ* (in Sanskrit). 2 parts. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Sawai, Yoshitsugu. 1992. *The faith of ascetics and lay Smārtas: A study of the Śaṅkaran tradition of Śṛṅgeri*. Vienna: Sammlung de Nobili.

Sawyer, Dana. 1993. Monastic structure of Banarsi Dandi Sadhus. *In* Bradley R. Hertel and Cynthia Humes, eds., *Living Banaras: Hindu religion in cultural context*, 159–80. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sax, William S. 2000. Conquering the directions: Religion and politics in Hinduism. *International journal of Hindu studies* 4, 1: 39–60.

Sewell, Robert. 1975 [1883]. *A sketch of the dynasties of southern India*. Delhi: Cosmo.

Sharma, Raj Gopal. 1987. *Kanchi Kamakoti Math: A myth*. Varanasi: Ganga-Tunga Prakashan.

Shastry, A. K. 1982. *A history of Sringeri*. Dharwad: Karnatak University.

Śivānanda, Svāmī. 1993. *Lives of saints*. Shivanandanagar: The Divine Life Society.

Sprockhoff, Joachim F. 1976. *Saṃnyāsa: Quellenstudien zur Askese im Hinduismus* (in German). Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Śrīharṣa. 1952. *Naiṣadhīyacarita* (in Sanskrit). Bombay: Nirnayasagara Press.

Subrahmanya Sastri, S., ed. 1982–90. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad Bhāṣya Vārttikam: Ānandagiri-ṭīkā-saṃvalitam* (in Sanskrit). 2 vols. Mount Abu: Maheśānusandhāna Saṅsthānam.

Subramuniyasvāmī, Satguru Śivāya. 1993. *Dancing with Śiva*. Hawai'i: Himalayan Academy.

Sundaresan, Vidyasankar. 2002. What determines Śaṅkara's authorship? The case of the *Pañcīkaraṇa*. *Philosophy East and West* 52, 1: 1–35.

Sunil, K. P. 1987. The curious case of the missing monk. *The illustrated weekly of India* 13 September: 9–17.

Swaminathan, K. D. 1957. *The Nāyakas of Ikkeri*. Madras: P. Varadachary.

Tapasyānanda, Svāmī, trans. 1980 [1978]. *Śaṅkara-dig-vijaya: The traditional life of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya by Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya*. Madras: Ramakrishna Math.

Tarkapanchanana, Jayanarayana and Nabadweep Chandra Goswami, eds. 1982 [1868]. *Śaṅkaravijaya* (Anantānandagiri) (in Sanskrit; English introduction). Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag.

Thurman, Robert A. F. 1991. *The central philosophy of Tibet*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tripathi, T. M., ed. 1917. *Tarkasaṅgraha* (Ānandagiri) (in Sanskrit; English introduction). Baroda: Gaekwad Oriental Research Institute.

Upadhyaya, Baladev. 1967. *Śrī Śaṅkaradigvijaya: Mādhavācārya viracita* (in Sanskrit and Hindi). Hardwar: Śrī Śravaṇanātha Jñānamandiram.

Upadhyaya, Kasinath. 1986 [1907]. *The Dharmasindhu by Kāśīnātha Upādhyāya* (in Sanskrit; English introduction). Delhi: Sri Satguru.

Veezhinathan, N., ed. 1971. *Anantānandagiripraṇītam Śrīśaṅkaravijayam* (in Sanskrit; English preface and introduction). Madras: University of Madras.

Veezhinathan, N., ed. 1972. *The Saṃkṣepa Śārīraka of Sarvajñātman* (in Sanskrit; English introduction). Madras: University of Madras.

Venkataraman, K. R. 1959. *The throne of transcendental wisdom*. Trichy: Trichinopoly United Printers.

Venkataraman, N. 1923. *Sankaracarya, the great, and his successors at Kanchi*. Madras: Ganesh.

Weber, Max. 1958 [1920]. *The religion of India: The sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism* (ed. and trans. Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale). New York: Free Press.

Wilson, Horace H. 1977 [1861]. *A sketch of the religious sects of the Hindus*. New Delhi: Cosmo.

VIDYASANKAR SUNDARESAN is an independent scholar residing in San Diego, California.